THEOLOGY

VOL. XXXIX OCTOBER, 1939 No. 232

EDITORIAL

"IT will be hundreds of years before full justice can be done to the impressive drama of contemporary history. Only through the perspective of centuries can all the complex and multifarious tendencies and movements of these decades be brought into a synthetic whole. The comprehension of the total situation will require the co-operation of many minds as well as of many generations."[1] This is a reminder which, at all times and under conditions of war especially, we are tempted impatiently to brush aside. Our own propaganda no less than the German, the utterances of our national leaders no less than of theirs, seek to induce in us the belief that the issues are perfectly simple and easily intelligible. It is inevitable no doubt that for propaganda purposes those responsible for the conduct of a war should thus seek to simplify matters. And it is true, of course, that we cannot evade the responsibility of making a decision now; we cannot wait for hundreds of years in order to do that. We are all caught in the meshes of a situation in which no course of action is innocent, yet in which we must needs choose some course of action. An Englishman cannot fail to recognize the depth and sincerity of the conviction that the forcible overthrow of Nazi principles is a moral duty which is laid upon this country. But for our part we cannot repeat the national slogan that "our conscience is clear." Nor can we glorify our own position by designating the war as "one man's crime." The devilry of Hitlerism does not automatically transform us into angels of light or prophets of the Lord. It is easy to forget, and we have already forgotten, the shortcomings of French policy in the years immediately following the Peace of Versailles: its repeated attempts to intrigue for the formation of separatist movements within Germany (especially for the establishment of a separate Bavarian state); its invasion of the Ruhr; its refusal of Mr Lloyd

[1] Reinhold Niebuhr, *Reflections on the End of an Era*, p. 121.

George's wish to admit Germany to the League of Nations during his Coalition Government; and the discreditable intrigue which preceded Germany's actual admission in 1926. When we speak of "French policy" we do not desire to exculpate ourselves from equal responsibility for that policy. It has been well said that Poincaré was the political father of Hitler. International politics are, in fact, a struggle for power which can be only partially and precariously moralized.

* * * * *

It is the duty of the Church to insist upon this unpalatable truth. The Church best serves the nation not by uncritically endorsing the pure idealism of its professed war aims, but by proclaiming the Word of God, which shows even the noblest human purposes to be shot through with sin. The Church best serves the nation not by seeking to keep up the nation's morale, but by humbling its pride. We deserve not "some measure" of God's judgment, but the full measure. Only as that is interpreted to us and as we are led to acknowledge it, is there any hope that we may be brought to that repentance which is infinitely more important than the victory of our arms. Christians are therefore called to careful and critical thought, to see the present European catastrophe in the perspective of Christendom's apostasy. We must eschew honeyed words about "the common faith which unites us in the most sacred of all causes," at least until we are quite sure what they mean and whether they are justified. The Bishop of Norwich tells us that "this is no time to dwell on the careful qualifications which take the edge off our common faith."[1] We disagree. At all events there would be no point in continuing to publish a periodical like this if it were bound to become for the duration of the war an uncritical organ of the national propaganda. We hope to provide space for examinations of our alleged common faith which make qualifications as careful and as scrupulous as possible.

* * * * *

At the same time we do not intend that THEOLOGY shall become entirely topical. The flame of thought, whether critical or constructive, dim enough before the war began, is bound to burn lower still while the war lasts. But that

[1] Article in the *Sunday Times*, September 3, 1939.

is no excuse for suffering it to be extinguished. The theologian has permanent obligations, the fulfilment of which war inevitably impedes, but which it can never abrogate. While we must needs provide scope for sincere Christian thinking about the meaning of contemporary events, philosophical, historical and literary studies will still be in place, even if they appear to have no direct relevance to the issues that now loom largest. Above all, if any good is to come out of this war, it will be through a renewed apprehension of the Gospel and its everlasting authority. There is a larger number of men and women than appears on the surface who see that the issue of faith is still an open one and that they will be frustrated by perplexity until it is closed. We are rightly urged to worship and to pray; but those who impress this duty upon us seldom seem to realize that there are many honest and sensitive minds who will not be able to do this with integrity until the grounds of Christian belief have become clear and convincing to them, and worship and prayer have been purged of the associations which at present link them to a blind and romantic idealism.

* * * * *

The clergy have an unenviable and a perilous task. They are exempted from the ordinary requirements of military service. Why? Is it simply that they may be free to provide the consolations of religion for those who desire them or to keep the people calm? Or that they may serve the national cause by supplying it with the highest spiritual and moral sanctions? Or that the Church is an invaluable bulwark of the *status quo* which must at all costs be kept functioning? We have no means of knowing what motives prompted the Government to make this exemption; but whatever those motives may have been, the effect is to allow the clergy comparative freedom to rise to a fateful responsibility. They have to minister the things of God to people faced by the imminent peril of death. But they have to do much more than that. They stand within the nation, but as representatives of a society which transcends the nation. The spokesmen of the nation will speak from the national point of view, although they are sure to try to invest what can be no more than a relatively just political objective with an absolute authority. "Nations and classes, cultures and civilizations are usually able to use religion, not to reveal the imperfection and partiality of their

life and values, but to give the prestige of the absolute to what is relative and tentative."[1] It is for the clergy to "use religion" for its true purpose, to declare that there is no absolute authority but the Lord God, that there is no allegiance which may make upon us an absolute claim but allegiance to His holy Word in Jesus Christ, that there is no warrant in the Bible for the idea that our arms will be victorious because at the moment when war broke out we were comparatively in the right, that above our membership of our nation stands our membership of the body of Christ, that in Him we are one even while because of the necessities of the unredeemed political order we strive to destroy one another.

* * * * *

This is quite a different thing from that vague and cosmopolitan humanitarianism with which it has in the modern period often been confused. The unity of German and English Christians is not a romantic ideal; it is a naked fact. They receive here and now the body of the one Lord, there can be no more realistic enactment of unity than that. But it is also a terrible fact; nothing reveals more clearly the sinfulness of our sundered Churches than their failure to transcend the national strife. German and English Christians are each bound to their nation by ties of natural obligation and loyalty; we are all willing or unwilling cogs in the opposing war machines. But these ties which now divide us are in principle subordinate to the bond of membership in Christ's body. Will the clergy show Christians that in practice we are Christians first, and Germans and Englishmen after that in order of importance? So far there are ominous signs that the Churches are going to repeat the record of 1914-18.

* * * * *

We anticipated that on the outbreak of war our Government would at once be driven to exploit more fully the techniques which have given to the totalitarian states their efficacy and have heightened their demonic character. The prophecy that in war every state would be bound to go totalitarian is being accomplished under our eyes. At present all the available technical resources will be concentrated on winning the war. It will be folly to ignore the sinister possibilities latent in this centralization of power.

[1] Reinhold Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

At the outset through a singular conjunction of circumstances there appears to be virtual unanimity in the nation. There is no telling how long that will last; what grounds have we for believing that it is grounded in a fundamental unity of purpose which would inspire a reconstruction of the whole national life through social revolution? Are those who at present wield power inspired by such a purpose? Is it possible for a movement to gather force which will have that task in view and make realistic preparation for it? If so, the conquest of the centralized organs of power would be a preliminary necessity, though the conquest if it were to serve its purpose would have to be followed by a planned decentralization. Or is it romantic to believe that a group, which has once tasted absolute power, will ever willingly let it go? The corrupting effects of power even on the best-intentioned men must never be ignored.

* * * * *

Most people will obviously be too busily engaged to give much thought to these questions. Meanwhile, the conditions that will mould our future history will inexorably be coming into operation. Shall we once again begin to understand our situation only when it is already too late substantially to modify it? We trust that Christian thinkers, placed in the various fields of our national life, will warn the nation of the grave prospect that lies ahead. Whether we have either the resources or the opportunity to make concerted preparation for national regeneration seems more than doubtful. If not, the future will be desperate indeed. We should find more grounds for hope if our national complacency and optimism had been already shattered; as it is, everything is being done to reinforce those obsolete qualities. The leaders of the Church, like the leaders of the state, are too deeply committed to the maintenance of existing institutions to permit the hope that they will become the pioneers of a movement which would undermine the positions which they at present occupy.

"The sincere Christian revolutionary—none the less revolutionary and none the less sincere because his object is the fundamentally conservative one of preventing the break in historic continuity—comes at once and everywhere into inevitable conflict with the vested material and immaterial interests of his own Church. In this conflict there are but two solutions: the retreat to the socially ineffective

position of ' personal religion,' or the defence of the existing institutions, which is equally ineffective. There is no solution which allows the preservation of the positions in the old society and the simultaneous creation of a new society. This is no fault of the Christian revolutionaries themselves. It is impossible to be a revolutionary from within an existing order. Yet a Christian cannot act otherwise as long as the forms and institutions of the Churches are intact. The Christian new integration can become successful only after the routine of the Churches has been destroyed or, in other words, after persecution or social revolution has rendered impossible the maintenance of the outward institutions."[1]

[1] Peter F. Drucker, *The End of Economic Man*, p. 103—a book which we would strongly recommend, as also V. A. Demant, *The Religious Prospect*, which is reviewed elsewhere in this number.

Possessing our Possessions

A Study of some of the Problems and Possibilities of Morning and Evening Prayer.

The writer believes that the principles outlined in this article, written of course before war was declared, are as valid for services in time of war as in time of peace.

WORSHIP—the activity by which men seek God—has sometimes been imagined as a search after God to be prosecuted in complete detachment from the world. Film-goers will remember how the picture "Lost Horizon", assisted by superb photography, provided a delightful setting for the expression of this fancy. The tendency so to regard worship, though probably never wholly absent, only becomes widely apparent in times of world-weariness. It should need little argument to show the inconsistency of such an outlook with the religion of the Incarnation. "Shangri-La" and Bethlehem represent two diametrically opposed conceptions of God.

But far more serious is the widespread tendency, reflected amongst countless churchgoers, to make a divorce between worship on Sundays and work during the week. We must frankly admit the real difficulty, for instance, in relating the measured movement of the liturgical services of the Church and their God-ward emphasis with the rush and fever of secular life. And on the other hand the activities of business, the whole organization of an acquisitive society, appear to have no connexion with the things said and done in church. Men and women who genuinely believe in God, and who yet have to earn their daily bread in a setting which ignores Him, are driven to departmentalize their experiences. This makes for a division in life which cannot but be serious for the individuals who practise it, and in the long run must be destructive of true worship.

The ideal of Christian worship is an activity which sees God as the meaning of all life, and which goes out from the occasions of corporate meditation and worship in church, determined with His help to mould all human relationships to the pattern on the Mount—that is, to insist on linking Sunday to Monday.

It would be idle to pretend that this can be an easy achievement. In many a business activity the most that the Christian can be is a point of rebellion, a focus of protest. But every Christian can be that, and it would be a real

advance for the Kingdom of God if every Christian in his secular activity could feel the tension between what is and what ought to be and would accept the pain of it, nor seek for anodyne. Then in some places, when there are groups of Christian men, there could be corporate thinking with the prospect of corporate action.[1]

Now without for a moment losing sight of the actual world-context within which the Church has to worship, this present article would proceed to consider certain aspects of the worship of the Church as that is represented in the existing Sunday services. If the context outlined above is accepted, the first problem facing those responsible for the ordered worship of the Church is how to make that worship meaningful, how to ensure that it shall be demonstrably a real approach to God.

Worshippers who know themselves to be in real touch with God will not for long be at a loss how best to relate the activities of their daily life to their worship. But the task of relating worship and life is secondary to the making of worship a real approach to God. It is in His light that we shall see light. If this article can make some contribution to the first of these objectives it will have achieved its purpose.

Before, however, it is possible to consider how to give our worship this atmosphere of reality, it is important to be clear as to what Christian worship really is.

The Inner Meaning of Worship

Worship is an offering, a discovery, a response: an offering of ourselves for God—that is, the putting of ourselves in a position for God to act upon us; a discovery by ourselves of God and His will; a response of ourselves to God, a dedication to the doing of the will which we have discovered.

This definition safeguards a fundamental of Christian worship, which is that it is through and through an ethical activity. The God to whom we offer ourselves is active in the world, creating, sustaining, redeeming. Any discovery that we make is a discovery related to that activity. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," said our Lord. His words

[1] This whole issue has been raised in a most suggestive manner in the valuable article by the Rev. John Drewett in the July number of Theology entitled "Corporate Worship as the Expression of Community."

stand and test the genuineness of our worship by measuring it against its relatedness to the still continuing activity of redemption. Christian worship can never be an escape from life. It is a way into life, the life of the suffering and redeeming God. The response of worship must be in terms of the doing of that redemptive will, filling up some part of the sufferings of Christ.

Christian worship, then, is an offering, a discovery, a response, an activity related to life, something real and recognized as such.

The Congregation at Worship

But some limitation in the scope of so vast a subject is necessary. This article, then, will concentrate attention on the services of Morning and Evening Prayer. This limitation has been chosen for the following reasons:

1. The attention of liturgiologists and reformers has been concentrated almost entirely upon the service of Holy Communion, in which only a minority of worshippers join with any frequency or regularity.[1]
2. It is to the services of Morning and/or Evening Prayer that the majority of people come who attend our churches.
3. It is to one or other of these services in the majority of cases that people will come first after they have been won for Christ by the evangelistic activity of the Church.
4. The due consideration of how these services can to-day play their part in the living worship of the Church is long overdue.

Who are the people who come to these services? It is important that we recognize the different types who do come, for they in part create the problems that face us.

First, there are the earnest and keen Church members. It will be seen in due course that even this group must be subdivided. But at any rate they represent the kernel upon which the reality of a service of worship largely depends.

Second, there is a considerable number, in some congregations as much as fifty per cent. or more, who are generally sympathetic to the Church, are vaguely religious, but very

[1] A statistical survey of any rural deanery in the country would justify this statement.

much alive to the "folly, sin, and danger of being righteous overmuch." These excellent people are anything but regular.

Third, there are those who limit their attendance to the great festivals, not a few of whom come only at the harvest time.

Finally, there are those who, either through wireless sermons or through active evangelism, have been won for Christ. Some of these are lapsed churchgoers, but an increasing number are from completely non-Christian homes. In any church where there is active evangelism this group will represent a steadily growing number of worshippers.

The last group is of especial importance. Their interests alone demand an attitude of realism. It is sheer nonsense, for instance, to say, "The Church's worship is for regular church-people," and then to assume that therefore it is a matter of quite secondary importance whether or not the forms of worship are understood by others. That wooden attitude would be improper, even though understood, in an academic liturgiologist; it should be impossible for a pastor of souls or any keen churchman. Unfortunately it is very commonly voiced in gatherings of the clergy and of the more ecclesiastically minded laity.

There are, then, four different categories of persons worshipping in our churches: the keen nucleus, the benevolently interested, the casual, the recently converted. The casual will here be left out of major consideration, for if the others are finding reality, and creating it, the casual will be much more likely to be attracted.

It was noted above that the keen nucleus has to be subdivided. This subdivision corresponds to the very real difference between the young and those who are not so young. The Church services have never had the mentality of the young in mind. Yet not only are many of these young people to-day proved to be sceptical of the value of forms designed to express the ideas of a slower moving age, but young people with active minds do value an element of variety in all their activities. This applies also in worship. With increasing years, as we know, there comes a revulsion against variety. Older people want the assurance that in the flux of life some things stand sure. In their worship they like to know what is coming next. Now our Prayer Book and its rubrics meet their need. Yet our Prayer Book

and its rubrics mechanically obeyed make for a worship which, while being correct no doubt, does tend all too easily to give the impression that more value is set on correctness than on that real awareness of God which is the fruition of worship. A service which gives that impression will never lead young people to worship God.

It is obviously no part of our task to pander to youth and to ignore age. Our task is to provide a worship in which people of different ages will find their approach to God. There must be give and take by all. Liturgy is impossible without an ordered framework, quite apart from the legitimate demand of older people for the familiar. Yet within the ordered framework there should be elasticity. This was one merit of the Deposited Book. It recognized the necessity and propriety of greater variation within an ordered framework.

Great Acts of Worship

What, then, is here advocated? Is this a thinly disguised plea for stunt services? Emphatically, no. There are indeed times and places when what are wrongly sneered at as stunts have their proper and valuable place. Every departure from tradition partakes of the nature of a stunt, and not all have been bad. It was a "stunt" when the psalms were first set to chants other than plainsong. Hymns were once "stunts" with a most doubtful parentage. But here there is no concern to advocate anything that could be called a stunt, and that for the all-sufficient reason that the writer believes that in the services of Morning and Evening Prayer, properly understood and intelligently interpreted, there is a vehicle of worship that is both authentically Christian and essentially congenial to the mentality of the people of this country. Probably it is not for export, but it is something thoroughly indigenous of which we can be humbly and gratefully proud.

But on all sides we are throwing away this priceless possession by the unreality and unrelatedness of our manner of worship. Sometimes this is done by carelessness, sometimes through defeatism, sometimes through lack of imagination, but most often because we forget that rubrics were made for man's worship and not man for the worship of rubrics.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the Services of

Morning and Evening Prayer are potentially great acts of worship.

Two general facts about these services may be noted. First, they follow the simple pattern of true devotional exercise. Penitence makes way for the assurance of forgiveness; there follows an alternation of praise and meditation. This finds its outlet in affirmation and so leads on to petition, intercession and dedication. That is a profoundly right approach to God, and it is satisfying to the mind even when there may be no conscious apprehension of a clearly marked sequence.

In the second place, these services are supreme as an expression of congregational worship, because they offer the members of the congregation scope for active co-operation *without respect to their devotional capacity.* Even the service of Holy Communion does not offer the same scope for such co-operation by the congregation as do these services. The doubtful need only analyse the structure of the services to appreciate this fact. Indeed the structure of no other liturgical service in Christendom offers such scope to the laity as does the structure of the services of Morning and Evening Prayer in our Church.

That is a big factor in their appeal.

These two merits are merits of structure. It says much for those merits that they are able to retain the loyalty of so many worshippers even when the services are interpreted without any feeling for their real value and without any attempt to see them in the context of the life of the congregation.

Making Corporate Worship Real

Our real task, then, is to see how through these services we may realize our desire that our worship of God in church shall impress men and women with its reality, appeal to them by its sincerity, attract them by its dignity, and win them by its manifest relevance to their daily life.

There are four points upon which our attention needs to be concentrated.

1. First, there is widespread need for instruction, not only in the meaning of worship, but also in the point and relevance of the different parts of the service. Prayers, psalms, creed, hymns, all these are really important, but their importance and significance are not always immediately

apparent. Courses of sermons and instructions on these points are of real value and are very greatly appreciated. Simple pamphlets giving instruction on these different parts of the service have proved of real help to many in their approach to the Church services.

But this first point, important as it is, will not avail unless the layman can see that the clergy themselves are giving meticulous attention to the details of worship.

2. The second and perhaps most important point, then, is attention to detail. The actual beginning of the service calls for very particular care. Reference was made above to the true devotional pattern of our worship, starting, as it does, with the note of penitence. But surely it is apparent that the approach to the General Confession is far too abrupt. This abruptness tends towards making the General Confession nothing more than a formality. Now if a service starts at an unreal level it will probably never recover. When it is remembered that the General Confession is almost always said far too quickly to be in any sense an act of worship, it will be seen what a lamentable beginning our services often have.

There is, further, a theological objection to so abrupt a beginning of worship with the note of penitence, for this means that the first thought of the service is of man's own sinfulness. Surely the first thought in worship should be of God. Then, naturally, we shall turn to penitence. But we need to make this thought of God explicit, and to this end the value of an opening hymn is urged. Eminent liturgiologists oppose this, but have they fully considered the problem from the particular point of view of the services which we are considering? They object, and rightly, to a hymn being sung simply in order to get the clergy and choir into their places. But that is not the reason for the opening hymn. This hymn should be designed to lift the people's hearts to God in adoration. The hymn will be short and it ought to be plainly objective in character. Here admittedly lies a real difficulty. There are few purely objective hymns in the English language. For instance, in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* there are only about twelve which are wholly appropriate at this point in the service. Some compromise with the ideal will therefore sometimes be necessary.

When the service begins in this way with a hymn, the Sentences should sum up the hymn and be followed by a

bidding to prayer. A time of silence may follow, and then will come the General Confession. This does not in any way break the order of the service, but it does make for reality at the start, particularly if the congregation is instructed as to the purpose of the opening hymn. Above all, it ensures that the emphasis of the service at its beginning shall be laid on Adoration. Some vision of God must precede an understanding of the awfulness of sin and the need of forgiveness.

The rest of the service contains matters of detail scarcely less important than its proper beginning. There is, for instance, the question of the lessons. The people who come to church on Sundays have not, for the most part, been reading the Bible according to the Lectionary during the week. What sense do we imagine they make of the following sequence—Job i, Job iii, Job xix, Job xxix, 1 Sam. xvii, 2 Sam. i, 2 Sam. xviii, 1 Kings x ? Yet those represent suggested readings for the first lesson at Morning Prayer on the first eight Sundays after Trinity. Whatever course is taken with regard to the Lectionary, a short preface interpreting the message of the lesson is often quite indispensable, especially in the case of some Old Testament passages.

Again, when we remember that in most churches to-day the morning and evening congregations consist of different people, it becomes somewhat difficult to believe that the revised list of proper psalms can be meant to be any more than a very general guide. According to this revised list the morning congregation gets only one chance in the year to sing such great songs of praise as the 19th, the 23rd and the 121st psalms, and never gets a chance of singing the 150th psalm at all.

Is that making the best possible use of that imperishable anthology of devotion, our Lord's own hymn-book, which we know as the Psalter ?

The choice of hymns to which reference has been already made in considering the beginning of the service is of quite first-rate importance, though beset by many real difficulties. Hymns are not just an excuse for community singing. The whole meaning of a service and its impact on the congregation can be spoilt by carelessness over the choice of hymns.

The prayers which follow the Third Collect represent a detail of real value, for they can not only show the relevance

of corporate prayer to the immediate problems in people's minds, but they can also be a means of leading the congregation in aspiration to know God's will and to do it. A recent questionnaire on Church Worship, directed to men and women, young and old, representing every level of culture in the community, was emphatic in its unanimity on the value of non-liturgical and topical prayers at this point in the service.

A warning should, however, be noted here that the striking of a balance between the familiar and the unfamiliar is a matter for very fine adjustment. There can be no mechanical substitute for a sensitive spirit. The temptation to the clergy to force the pace and to be far ahead of their congregation's understanding in this matter is a temptation to be watched and resisted.

The prayers after the Third Collect have a further value as offering the opportunity for practice in corporate silence. Real living stillness is important in worship.

It is perhaps not out of place here to make the point that few things make more for togetherness in worship and a spirit of reality than a due regard for proper pauses, and the recognition of those occasions when a pause is meaningless.

3. The third point to which more attention needs to be drawn is the value of unity in the service. At the great festivals this comes about quite naturally through a choice of psalms and lessons and hymns and sermon, all of which reinforce each other in a cumulative act of praise and thanksgiving. But on other occasions this must be left to the individual care of the clergy. When real trouble is taken over securing this unity the service becomes a revelation of what the ordered ascent of heart and mind and will can be. Care of this sort is abundantly rewarding, not only in the real appreciation it draws from the regular congregation, but also in the testimony of those who come to church quite casually and are profoundly impressed.

The service, of course, in its very movement is a unified act of worship. But this underlying unity is not always easily discernible. It is a help when attention can be concentrated, and this can be done in a variety of ways. A dominant theme recurring in each part of the service is one way of realizing this. Another way may be found when the hymns form a progression of thought; still another when the lessons and prayers are linked to the sermon. It

is important to add that the value of this does not depend on the worshipper's ability consciously to trace the unity. Provided the unity is there it will often happen that the worshipper, though unable to distinguish the unifying principle, yet is aware of having shared in a service in which every part has been coherent.

4. There remains the fourth point—the place of the sermon in worship.

Morning and Evening Prayer are essentially services of the Word. The sermon occupies a decisive place. Let there be no illusion. For the average person who comes to church the sermon is still of central importance. Nor is that something to be deplored, provided that we remember *always* that the sermon is not meant to be a moral essay, nor just the opportunity to air the vicar's latest fad, still less the occasion for commenting favourably or unfavourably on the policy, or lack of it, of the Government in office. The sermon is meant to be a proclamation of the Gospel, the declaring of the Word of the Lord, with its immediate application to the whole congregation, including the preacher himself. The preacher is essentially the mouthpiece of another, and that other—God.

This declaring of the Word of the Lord is not a talking *at* the congregation, but a talking *in* the congregation. God's will is declared to the people, and at the same time the people give their assent to the declaration. It is a fearful and terrible responsibility to stand in any pulpit. A corresponding responsibility rests upon the congregation. Both preacher and hearer must in heart and mind be concerned to know God's will, to receive it, and to obey it. Preaching is thus a corporate act of worship. Just because it is that it takes up into itself the whole of what has gone before. The best sermon is that which springs as it were straight from the acts of prayer and praise which have preceded it. This opens up a subject of so vast a range that only this hint can be given here. But it is quite vital to the whole subject of worship.

Much Land to be Possessed

This article began by positing as an urgent problem facing Christians to-day the need to relate worship on Sunday to the life of the working week. Something of the inherent difficulty of the task was recognized at the outset, and it

must be obvious that it will involve many other activities far beyond the scope of this article. Drama and literature, music and architecture will each play a part. Hard thinking and self-sacrificial living will be indispensable. But informing and inspiring each and all of these should be the discovery of God made in a corporate worship that is felt to be real.

The purpose of this article has been the modest one of considering how in practice it is being proved possible to secure an infusion of reality into the two most widely familiar services of the Church, and to raise the question of principle which underlies the practice.

Only a *first* step in the direction of relating worship to life is here indicated, but that first step contains revolutionary possibilities, for it involves the frank recognition of the principle that forms of worship must be moulded to fit the aspirations of men rather than that men's aspirations should be moulded to fit the forms of worship.

M. A. C. Warren.

A Nursery of Christian Ecumenism

The Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland celebrates its fiftieth anniversary during the month of October, 1939. It is not the only, though it is by far the most important, Christian movement among university students in this country. Its significance, however, lies as much in the effects it has created within the general body of British Church life as in its specialized work for the university population; better, perhaps, to say that because it had the unique privilege of serving a student class the special religious notes which arose within the Movement were carried into and developed within a very wide field. It will be the attempt of this short article to define and estimate certain of these notes or characteristics, and to show how they have affected the Church life of our time, particularly in the movement for Christian unity.

In the United States, where the first of the national bodies which now comprise the World's Student Christian Federation was founded, the Movement grew out of the Young Men's Christian Association and remained a part of it. In Great Britain the origin was different. Here the beginning was a union of students who purposed to become foreign missionaries, formed for the purpose of winning

other students to the missionary vocation and of educating the university public on the urgency and importance of the missionary call. The earliest group of this kind was formed in October, 1889, and the Student Volunteer Missionary Movement was organized in 1892. A year later there was founded what was then called the British College Christian Union (now the Student Christian Movement), and it is important to observe that the prime reason for the founding of this latter body was to create a base in the colleges upon which the missionary movement might be supported.

Naturally, it was not long before the interests of the Movement widened. From the beginning, the evangelization of the student population at home occupied a place parallel to that of the missionary call in the life of the Movement. Soon the problems of faith, of the understanding of the Bible, of apologetic and dogmatic, began to force themselves to the front, and later came the awakening to the call of social reconstruction at home and of international relationships. Naturally, a Movement whose membership almost entirely changes every four years and which is ruled by a committee of students and very young graduates is bound to have its ups and downs and to reflect, with an almost excessive readiness, the changing fashions and movements of thought. But it can be said by anyone who has been at all intimately conversant with the life of the Movement that the very centre of its life and strength has always been the same. It has never forgotten that it is essentially not a movement of the intelligentsia for religious culture, but a movement for evangelism and the awakening of the sense of vocation.

A good many years ago my colleague, J. H. Oldham, said to me that for him the Student Movement meant, when he joined it in its early days, two things mainly: "the Student Volunteer declaration and the morning watch." I think I could say the same of my own entry into it twelve years later. Under these phrases, now perhaps outmoded for some, there lie two things of radical importance for any sort of Christian living. The facing of the Student Volunteer declaration, "It is my purpose, if God permit, to become a foreign missionary," meant the facing of divine vocation. "What wouldst Thou have me to do?" It was not only a matter of missionary keenness, though that was the form in which it was clothed; it meant that the recognition of

the divine call to every man lay at the foundation of life, and that there was no peace to be had unless you came to terms with it. As for the " morning watch "—the phrase then used in evangelical circles for the regular practice of private prayer and Bible study—who can overestimate the value of a movement which instils into its members from the beginning of their membership the need of an accepted rule of private devotion? I write as one of the many who are still but in the infant class of this school of prayer; but at least I can say that I owe it to the Student Christian Movement that I possess, to put it at its lowest, a reproachful sense of obligation in the matter.

It is not necessary here to write in any detail of the contribution which this Movement has made to the missionary cause. Suffice it to say that during its existence over 4,000 student volunteers have gone abroad as missionaries, practically all under the great denominational missionary societies. Both at Jerusalem in 1928, and at Tambaram last December, it would have almost been easier to count those members of the International Missionary Council meetings who had not been in the Student Movements of the world than those who had.

I turn now to another aspect of the Movement. At a very early point in its development (as Canon Tatlow makes abundantly plain in his *Story of the Student Christian Movement*) what had begun as a keenly evangelistic, somewhat individualistic affair became conscious of the crucial importance of the Church. The undergraduate might perhaps find his religious life during the weeks of college term mainly within the keen and devout atmosphere of the Movement; but that could never be more than a part of his life even while a student, and what of the later years? Even more important was the fact that as the Movement grew it attracted the attention, critical and friendly, of men and women to whom Church life was of the *esse* of Christianity, and it became necessary to face all the implications of the relationship of a voluntary non-official and non-ecclesiastical movement to the life and the authority of the Church, in its several branches or parts. I wish, as a Presbyterian, here to acknowledge the quite priceless value of the Anglican pressure at this point. Such men as Father Kelly of the S.S.M. did two things for crowds of the members of the Student Movement whom he met at the summer camps. One was that he incarnated a life of Christian devotion to

which the obedience, fellowship and cultus of the Church were essential. The second was that in mastering this fact they found also that the Church was divided, deeply divided, and that the earnest camaraderie of their own evangelistic and missionary fellowship had no automatic remedy for this state of division.

We use terrible jargon in trying to say what we mean about Christianity, and " interdenominationalism " is not one of the nicest of words; but there cannot be any doubt that in the principle stated in that word, and in the difference between it and the other locution " undenominationalism," there lay an insight of very great importance. I doubt whether it would really be saying too much if one claimed that it was the clear apprehension of the truth that unity was not to be found by evading differences, but by facing them and holding together what might seem almost contraries, that made possible the more recent developments in Christian ecumenical action. When one speaks here of the Student Movement, what, I suppose, one really means is that large but somewhat amorphous group of people, some students, some young graduates, some officials of the Movement, some (not the least important) senior people, who by frequent visits as speakers to student conferences had become part of the living whole, that in practice hung together and thrashed out a common attitude. The Movement, let it be remembered, had come out of a *milieu* where what one takes to be " undenominationalism " was the rule; that is, where the basis of unity was a set of common convictions, and matters arousing division were left outside. " Interdenominationalism " meant that speakers at a summer conference were to be encouraged to give their whole message, and not to be deterred from doing so by the fear of offending those to whom what they had to say might be strange or even distasteful. We are all well used to this now, but it is probable that no group of men and women are so truly responsible for the spread of this difficult but liberating doctrine as the group who revolved round the S.C.M. in the years just before and just after the Great War.

The full acceptance of this attitude on ecclesiastical questions had many consequences. It meant the coming of the Church of England, in all its schools of thought, into fellowship with the Movement. That in its turn made it easier for such men as the late Bishops Gore and Talbot to give their support to, and themselves to attend, the World

Missionary Conference at Edinburgh, 1910, out of which came the International Missionary Council, "Faith and Order" and many other things. Especially in connexion with the missionary movement, but to an increasing extent in the contacts of the Churches themselves, free and candid co-operation, based upon a full recognition of differences, has become familiar and customary.

It would, however, be a mistake to suggest that the frank recognition of the principle of interdenominationalism had its sole effect in bringing Anglicans more fully within the fellowship of the S.C.M. In every part of the wider Church (always excepting, to our regret, the Roman obedience) the acceptance of the principle carried with it a greater trust in the Movement on the part of those who took seriously their Church life and principles. One remembers (and Canon Tatlow's story is luminous on this point) how at the beginning it was by no means acceptable to many Free Churchmen that disputed matters, and views to which they were themselves diametrically opposed, should be freely expounded in mixed gatherings. But it was not long before it became clear that only so could true Churchmanship of any brand be fostered. The idea of a unity, far off but yet apprehensible to faith, enriched by the converging of traditions that had lived widely separate, was not soon or easily conceived; but an immediate and universally understood result was the sharing of treasures in devotional life. That was an immediate and blessed consequence of the interdenominational movement, and men were so sure of the good of it that they could tread the rather strange and uncharted path of interdenominational discussion and co-operation without fear.

Yet it may also be said that had it not been for the continuous pressure of the missionary and evangelistic life of the Movement, this interdenominational method, with its emphasis on the facing of differences, might have become dangerous. The danger lies in the tacit acceptance of difference, clearly understood and analysed, as final. Interdenominationalism might mean only the petrifaction of the *status quo*. But so long as the evangelization of the world is the final category that governs both thought and action there is always the saving impulse to go beyond difference to the unity, deeper and richer, which the difference suggests. To live vividly and consciously in a divided Church, and not to forget that the division of the

Church is a wounding of our Lord and a barrier to the Church's witness, must always mean a determination to go beyond difference.

It is worth noting here that the Student Movement, in spite of continual discussion of the subject, has always clung to its principle that in the matter of intercommunion, or of open communion, and indeed in regard to the whole question of sacramental observance, it must leave the necessary decisions to the Churches, that it is not itself a Church, and that its members should be bound by the rules of the body to which they belong.

I have suggested that the Student Christian Movement has helped in the development of an ecumenical Christianity in our time, first, by its insistence on the central evangelistic and missionary obligation resting upon the Church and upon all Christians; and second, by its frank recognition of the fact of difference in Church principle and its search for a mode of common action and fellowship which should do justice to that fact. There is, however, another aspect of the Movement which must be touched on in conclusion, not less relevant to our main topic than either of the other two points. That is its intimate contact with the Christian life, and especially the Christian student life, of other nations on the widest possible scale. The World's Student Christian Federation unites Christian movements of students in most of the countries of the world in which there are universities. Not only this, but the fellowship is made real by intervisitation, occasional large conferences, publications, financial aid and in many other ways. At the annual conferences at Swanwick or at the large quadrennial gatherings, always the most interesting single meeting is that at which the delegates from foreign countries appear and speak. Much attention is given to caring for foreign students within the British Isles. The result is that every year a certain number of those in the inner circles of the Movement (a number constantly changing and over a generation amounting to a considerable force) have made personal friendships and obtained personal insights into the life, especially the Christian life, of other countries, that must permanently affect their own lives. Moreover, the interdenominational position above described has been worked out in the wider field of the Federation. There is, for instance, a special arrangement made whereby a Russian Movement, definitely Orthodox,

can be affiliated, though in the normal case territorial limits define the units of the Federation and not ecclesiastical. This was done as the only practicable way of linking the students of Russian Orthodoxy in exile with the W.S.C.F., and it has been a success. Further, the word international means to the S.C.M. not merely Europe and America, but the East and Africa as well. It would be easy to name a score of men and women, Indian, Chinese, Japanese, African, who have come to play a large part in the lives of British students, and have carried into their own service in the East or Africa the priceless advantage of incorporation within a really ecumenical fellowship.

It is not difficult to see the relevance of this fact to the Christian ecumenical movement as a whole. It is through this kind of early training that the men and the women are being produced who can most easily and naturally handle the problems of a growing ecumenical Christianity. Here again there are dangers. Nothing is easier than to generate a mild internationalism. In the S.C.M. there have been times when interest in the Christian students of other lands seemed that it might obscure the missionary objective. A little learning may be a dangerous thing in international contacts as elsewhere. But one returns to the truth, which all who know and love the Student Christian Movement will acknowledge, that the saving salt has always been the deep central conviction about evangelism and the Christian obligation to the world.

WILLIAM PATON.

Notes on Grace and Human Nature

JEREMIAH represents Jehovah as saying to the Jews: "Ye shall be my people, and I will be your God" (xxx, 22). This is the most lucid expression of the election of the chosen people. That Jehovah should be the God of Israel, and Israel the people of God—that a personal relationship, justifying the use of the genitive case, should exist, by God's will, between man and God—is the first constituent of the idea of grace.

In Deuteronomy it is written: "The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people . . . but because the Lord

loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers" (vii, 7, 8); and again: "Understand, therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land . . . for thy righteousness" (ix, 6). This election, then, this divinely ordained relationship of man to God, is declared to be unmerited and covenanted; man does not deserve it—God promises it. If we add the obvious notion that this relationship is beneficial to man, we are possessed of all that is essential to the idea of grace. Whether we think of the divine gift, or of the human endowment, grace is that whereby man stands in a beneficial, unmerited and covenanted personal relationship to God, based upon the free act of God Himself.

It will be remarked that nothing precisely corresponding to the term "grace" is found in these passages, which are solely concerned with God's election of His people. Yet the traditional account of election, predestination, or salvation is stated in terms of grace; traditional theology absolutely requires the notion of "that whereby" the love of God is operative in men. This is not a mere question of terminology. Against tradition, there is a school of thought—not mere thoughtlessness—in which grace finds no room. As I write these words, you read them: "that whereby" the relation of writer and reader is established is my pen, your eyes—*ego*, *vos*. Why look beyond the two terms for "that whereby" we are related in religion to God?

The traditional answers are based upon traditional metaphysics. For example, Aquinas argues thus: "the will of man is moved by the good already present in things, whereas, in the case of God, it is from his love that good results in things" (*S. Th.* I-II, cx, 1); the result of God's love in our souls is the *habitus* of sanctifying grace. But the whole scholastic notion of "good" is so remote from modern preoccupations that the cogency of this argument cannot be appreciated without some special application.

Again, the necessity of grace arises, traditionally, from the consideration of Man and his End. The end of man is perfect bliss in the contemplation of God as He is in Himself; but this is beyond the power of human nature to attain; therefore something besides nature is necessary to man, and this we call grace. Such an argument can be stated in a variety of ways, and can be made to look

quite modern; but its cogency depends upon the Aristotelian conception of "end," and is not, therefore, absolute. The traditional dialectic, proving that bliss is only attainable in another world, has resisted the pressure of modern anti-rationalism better than most other parts of the scholastic synthesis. The conclusion is, after all, at least negatively confirmed by the factual absence of lasting bliss in this world. But if this were all, there is no demonstrating the necessity of grace—let a man but live well, doing what in him lies, and deserve Heaven; granted a special gift of God to the soul after death, what more need we suppose? For the Thomist, an "end" is a *principium operationis*; the term "final cause"—unintelligible to the man in the street—is integral to his discourse. If the end of man "exceeds the proportions of human nature" (*S. Th.* I-II, cix, 5) then all specifically human activity will be affected by this circumstance of his destiny; the need of grace will arise not merely at the end or finish of this life, but in every act which is relevant to that term, in every good work to be accomplished *sicut oportet ad salutem*. But the teleological way of thought, however valuable, is not universal or obligatory, and arguments based upon it have only a limited validity.

If we are to defend the notion of grace from the imputation of superfluity, we cannot, then, rely solely upon traditional reasonings in their traditional form. This does not mean that we must abandon tradition.

The idea which we have found in certain books of the Old Testament, of a personal relationship of man to God, is universally part of the religious attitude. The degenerate mythology of totemism preserves this idea in the crude form of a supposed blood-relationship between each member of the clan and his totem. The doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, as Freud has shown, is coeval with human belief in God; and paternity cannot well be impersonal. The national election of the Jews was grounded in the promises made by God to Abraham, and each individual Jew was Abraham's child. Upon the summits of recorded religious experience, St Paul, St Augustine, St Francis, St Theresa, Pascal, bear witness to the essentially personal nature of the communion of man with God in religion; yet we need not suppose this position "mystical" or otherwise peculiar, for the most ordinary

and prosaic Christian piety must interpret in this sense the language of the Lord's Prayer.

To proceed by analogy: we find that personal relationships of men with each other suppose the continued existence of certain qualities in the men concerned. Parenthood and friendship supply classic examples. If a man's friend convincingly demonstrates an absence of friendliness by persistent malevolent behaviour, we may fairly say that the personal relation of friendship no longer exists between them. A man may indeed be in love without any return of his love; but he and his lady are not in this case lovers. Human parenthood is a social and biological affair, as well as a personal matter, and therefore this relationship is to some extent independent of personal qualities; but the expressions " disown," " no son of mine," " a true father to me," " an unnatural mother," sufficiently indicate that the personal aspect of parenthood supposes the persistence of parental and filial piety. I am not trying to assert any psychological effect of the " qualities " of others upon us, or even now so much as the existence for psychology of " qualities," much less to determine the psychological nature of a quality. *Pietas* and charm may be real things in the possessor, or projected upon him by another; to this I am at present indifferent. It remains true that personal relationships seem inevitably to require, from the point of view of the parties concerned, the possession of certain qualities in the parties.

Analogically, then, we expect to need some particular quality in order that we may stand in the personal relationship with God which religion invariably postulates. The theological name for this quality is grace—habitual or sanctifying grace: " this grace wherein we stand," in the words of St Paul (Rom. v, 2). At least we must admit the aptness of the notion. But perhaps, after all, it is only a metaphor, a symbol, an image, founded upon an anthropomorphic misunderstanding. Can we reasonably argue from human relationships to the relationship of religious devotion ? Is the analogical method here valid ontologically ?

We have seen, in passing, how the traditional case is made out: God, pure act, subsistent being, is the essential good; His love of a creature is not inspired by, but productive of, the good that is in that creature; such creative love must in fact produce in the elect soul the real quality

of sanctifying grace. There is a notable consensus of religious opinion to support the view that the quality of belonging to God is a real thing which some possess and others lack; the parable of the guest who had no wedding-garment only points the doctrine of regeneration which is fundamental in the Gospels. We are not concerned, however, with prescriptive arguments.

The meaning and implications of a personal relationship can perhaps be explored yet further with profit. We rightly feel that the savage who beats his idol because it does not give him what he wants (if that is in fact the savage's motive, which may be doubted) is irreligious, because the religious relation of man to God, besides being a personal relation, is founded upon the divine initiative, and irreversible. But at the other end of the scale, the deist whose God, in the words of Pascal, is not " the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but the God of the *philosophes*," a mechanistic abstraction, is also irreligious, because no personal relationship can be established with a formula. A certain connaturality is required in the parties. Those who have wished to discredit religion have compared the relation of man to God with that of mice or fish to men; others have, with better intentions, chosen the domestic dog for the third term of their parallel. The point of this difference is that men are accustomed to project human qualities into domestic animals, and so establish with them a fictitious connaturality, the potential foundation of a fictitiously personal relationship. It may be roundly asserted that if man had no kind of connaturality with God, religion would be impossible. The traditional explanation of the revealed words " in our image, after our likeness," is that intelligence and love, being spiritual acts, are common to us and to all spiritual creatures, and represent the perfection of the Holy Trinity in an especially adequate way; for God is essential good, essential truth, and to Him belong the fulness of intelligence and love. It is, I think, difficult to resist this position; most theists must grant it.

But if this personal relationship of the elect to God is founded upon a spiritual connaturality of intelligence and love, then we need not fear the use of analogy of human relationships, at least such as friendship, which has the same foundation. If human friendship supposes the quality of friendliness, or what not, in the parties, we may

safely argue that a man's belonging to God, in the religious sense, supposes some godly quality in him—not, of course, as the motive of God's love: even the human analogy does not suggest such a thing; but as a requisite part of the whole complex relationship.

To give the name grace to this quality is natural enough. χάρις can be translated in a variety of ways—beauty, loveliness, charm, on the one hand; kindliness, graciousness, gratitude, on the other—besides the concrete senses of boon, gift and so forth. Grace, and favour, are almost coterminous with χάρις, though not, of course, identical. When we speak of sanctifying grace, we mean, first, a boon or gift from God, expressive of His kindliness or favourable regard toward man; and secondly, a quality of supernatural loveliness, a beauty or charm in man which is pleasing to God, as no natural human superiority could ever be.

But such a description begs questions which have not so far been raised. What is this opposition of grace and nature?

No one will question the "opposition of grace and nature," if by "nature" is understood anything which should correspond to the Calvinist notion of the condition of fallen man. But the whole notion of original sin and the natural depravity of man, the whole theology of the fall, has been questioned; and even if it were not so, no conscientious inquirer would be satisfied with an account of grace and nature which was limited to the special applications of our present fallen state.

Approaching the question in a more general way, let us first consider the operation of what is traditionally called "actual grace."

Here so many ideas are habitually collected together in one confused mental picture, that it is worth while to dissociate them. Christian metaphysics at least—perhaps all sound philosophy—requires a reference to the First Cause in every created event. "In him we live and move"; our good actions cannot escape this fundamental law. But we shall not properly use the name "grace" for this general influence of God upon all our activity.

On the other hand, some good actions are so obviously difficult—as martyrdom—that we instinctively suppose a special assistance must have been given to enable men to accomplish them; and in our personal experience there may be remembered moments of exaltation and

heroism in which we achieved what would normally seem impossible with us. To account for these moments, it is natural to say that we were "inspired." It may be that if we analyse our own consciousness of such events, we cannot clearly distinguish in kind between, say, æsthetic or erotic exaltation, and ascetic achievement. That does not alter the fact of spasmodic heroism as a recognized part of human experience. "It hapneth unto ourselves," wrote Montaigne, "who are but abortive broods of men, sometimes to rowze our soule farre beyond her ordinary pitch." It is reasonable to suppose that some of these actions are "inspired" by God; though all manner of delusions await the man who makes this supposition too often.

This sort of "inspiration" is one kind of actual grace, the most obvious kind of grace, perhaps: but it is rare, and not typical. Also, the mysterious element in its working is greatly increased by the conditions of strain and ecstasy which accompany it. Eliot's masterly analysis of the motives and intentions of St Thomas of Canterbury before his martyrdom exhibits the difficulty of the subject-matter and the hopelessness of trying to discover the laws which govern the interactions of Grace and Nature by the inspection of such limiting cases.

Besides these special *auxilia*, we may observe a more ordinary kind of actual grace. As an example of what I mean, I hope I may be forgiven for describing an experience of my own. I had been reading a novel in which two men agree that churchmen are wrong to suggest that the deeds and words of Jesus would be of less value "if he'd been born the usual way and his body had lain still when he died." I had felt some indistinct repulsion, but read on. Later, when I was talking and thinking of something else, I remembered this passage, and at the same time perceived very clearly the orthodox contrary doctrine: that the "example" of Jesus is more than an example—is, in fact, the way of salvation—because His human nature was not limited by a human personality; that the communicable virtue of His work depends immediately upon His dual nature. At this moment, I felt a rather distinct mental satisfaction, the counterpart of my earlier repugnance. Without discussing the possibility that, or the sense in which, these particular experiences may have been "from God," I suggest that they are examples of very common phenomena indeed, corresponding closely with the

traditional account of actual grace. For this account includes not merely the postulate of a divinely initiated influence, but denominates certain acts of understanding and will as themselves properly called graces. With scholastic exactitude, it is asserted that these acts are of three kinds: acts of understanding (*e.g.*, the perception of some salutary truth); acts of will dependent upon intellectual perceptions (*e.g.*, the joyful acceptance of some salutary truth); and acts of will which are immediate, not dependent upon acts of understanding (*e.g.*, a movement of aversion from what is wrong). These acts—and again the experience I have quoted confirms, potentially, the traditional account—are called " indeliberate "; we do not formulate them upon a conscious plan, or as a result of reflection. We speak of them as graces, or as the effects of grace, indifferently; analysis reveals no sufficient complexity in the mechanism of their production to warrant us going any further back in our inquiry into the workings of actual grace.

Such common graces may serve to interpret the exceptional moments of heroism which we first discussed, for these may be seen to differ only in degree and in circumstances from moments of intellectual or moral rectitude.

If we reflect upon the kind of experience—indeliberate acts of understanding and will—wherein actual grace is to be found, we can directly approach one opposition of grace and nature. For indeliberate mental acts arise, by definition, out of unconsciousness (as creatures come, by definition, " out of nothing," *ex nihilo*)—we are not-conscious of their origin. And it must be allowed that the technique of psycho-analysis (I say nothing of the principles of the analysts) has given us some positive information about the unconscious or subconscious mind. Without distinction of schools, all psycho-analysts agree that the unconscious motives and intentions, desires and ideas of man are selfish, brutish and depraved. In happy circumstances, under the influence of a sound mental hygiene, a man can remain for long periods unaffected by these remote impulses and tendencies: but such a balance is precarious, and, above all, is imposed by consciousness, and does not arise, cannot arise, from within the unconscious, abiding self.

I have tried to escape the attitude and terminology of any particular school, and to describe what appears to be

generally accepted fact. This state of affairs corresponds very closely to the traditional description of the " state of fallen nature." When Aquinas explains how we come to need the assistance of actual grace *propter corruptionem sensualitatis*, because of the corrupt condition of our lower nature, he assumes, indeed, the fact of a " fall of man ": but his observation seems identical with the observation we can ourselves make—that we cannot confidently look within ourselves for good impulses or good ideas. The traditional view allows to human nature as it is in itself the power of subordinating our lower appetites to the dictates of our conscious mind, but recognizes that in practice this subordination is unlikely to be long or perfectly maintained, because the immediate effect of sense-impressions is likely to be stronger than any effect of intellectual discourse. This is not simply an *ad hoc* description of the accident of original sin. Aquinas himself explains with admirable lucidity (*Contra Gentiles* IV, lii) how this state of affairs—which Christians believe to be in fact a consequence of the fall of man—is essentially consonant with the fundamental conditions of human nature itself; thus happily anticipating Voltaire's critique of Pascal in the *Lettres Philosophiques*.

Such being the case, we are almost forced to the conclusion that actual grace consists in the immediate presentation to consciousness of determinants which, by their origin and direction, are contrary to the determinants which would " naturally " come to consciousness. That is one meaning of the " opposition of grace and nature."

(At this point is inserted the unsatisfactory problem of grace and freewill. Those who have, in effect if not ostensibly, denied the freedom of human action when it is done under the empire of grace—Jansenius, for example—have commonly also denied the freedom of man to resist the impulses of his lower nature. They represent, in theology, the extreme schools of Freudians and Behaviourists, for whom freewill is an illusion; and they are consistent in their positions. To me, these positions are repugnant, and seem untenable; but argument upon this question has proved inconclusive and unprofitable.)

The relation of nature and grace is not, however, merely one of opposite tendency. The substantive act, the good idea or the good desire or the good attitude, is itself a mental act, indistinguishable except in origin and direction

from any other; it is our act, in which our natural human powers are exhibited. This is one sense in which we are said to co-operate with grace—a physical co-operation, over which it can hardly be thought we have any control. It seems to involve a contradiction to speak, for instance, of a man failing to co-operate with a good desire by failing to feel that desire; yet if he feels it, he has already co-operated with the grace which that desire constitutes. The second, moral co-operation (which, to my sense, remains inalienably free in the crudest sense of the word), consists in a greater or less amount of subsequent and consequent good works.

An analogy of the operation of actual grace is the operation of helping a lame dog over a stile. You put his feet upon a step—he cannot choose but put his feet upon that step; so far he physically co-operates with you to produce the act or event which constitutes your help, your *auxilium*. He then exerts more or less of his own enfeebled muscular power, in order to gain for himself the benefit which you intend for him.

It is probable that he will soon come to another stile, when you will be two fields away; in any case, he remains lame. In this analogy, the function of habitual grace is represented by the health in his legs which you, if you are a vet., may be able to give him, and, if you are his owner, may be able to preserve to him by your continued care and attention.

In regard to human nature, the gift of habitual grace—the spirit of adoption—presents new and special problems. The traditional position is clear enough, but it depends upon a psychology which is expressed in unfamiliar terms, and chiefly upon the notion of *habitus*, a mental disposition of peculiar stability and power. The modern idea of " habit "—a conditioned reflex, more or less—is of no use here; in this sense, the love of God is certainly not a " habit." In the older sense, the trained skill of an artist or a dialectician, and the prudence of a wise director, were *habitus*, and in this sense the quality of being godly, the friend of God, is a *habitus*; not acquired by our own activity, however strenuous and well-directed, but infused, given by God Himself. We have no parallel in our experience for the idea of an infused *habitus*, though certain phenomena connected with the instinct of animals may (if used with discretion) serve as pointers. We can only arrive at the

notion by argument, along some such lines as were suggested in the opening paragraphs of these notes.

Now the usefulness of a *habitus* is that with it we are enabled to do, easily and promptly and well, something which we could do only badly without it, by complicated and laborious means. Consider a violinist: it is not physically impossible for me to draw a bow across a fiddle-string and produce a true note; but I should fail again and again, while a violinist would do it easily at once, and his tone would be better. In an analogous way, it is not physically impossible that a good life might be led, if God so willed, through the continually repeated assistance of particular actual graces. (This seems to be the notion of the life of grace entertained by most Jansenist theologians.) But the gift of "habitual" sanctifying grace makes the good life the normal exercise of a man's spiritual powers; he will need actual graces as the violinist needs particular application —to overcome special difficulties or produce special effects, and to improve his gift, talent or *habitus*.

In this aspect of the matter, habitual grace is seen to afford our human nature the benefit of an organized structure; by a due co-operation with actual graces we can become more full of grace. There is no opposition here of grace and nature, and the man in whom the gift of grace is richest is simply, from this point of view, the best man, the brightest specimen of human nature; just as the effects of actual graces are good human actions.

The other side of habitual grace is this: the possession of it enables us to live and act in such a way as to please God and win heaven, *sicut oportet ad salutem*. The same is true of actual grace; this is not merely assistance to perform some more or less difficult good work, but enables us to do something *sicut oportet*. The traditional term "supernatural" is applied to these fruits of grace, and suggests a perfect opposition of grace and nature; since from this point of view no event in nature has any value at all, but only through grace can man produce the least meritorious work. It remains true that a human action done *sicut oportet* remains an act of man; nor is this merely a physical co-operation, since a man cannot be saved against his will; so that even here nature is not against grace, but under grace; grace elevates but does not destroy nature. Along this line of thought lies the plain man's refutation of antinomianism. A godly work is a morally good work done *sicut oportet*;

the *officium* as well as the *finis* must be good; nothing which is evil or wrong by nature can become meritorious by any spiritual mumbo-jumbo. The fire of the Lord will refine gold; but if you put straw into it, you waste your straw.

There is another aspect of grace upon which I have hardly touched—namely, the healing power of grace, *gratia sanans*. Once let a man be at enmity with God as a consequence of sin, it is impossible he should in this condition do what is pleasing to God. This state of enmity is traditionally defined as a turning away from God, and an undue affection for some created thing or things. In this condition we are born, and into this condition we are ever ready to lapse. The gift of grace implies and effects a remedy, a conversion to God. In this sense, and in this sense alone, it is possible to affirm a direct and irreducible opposition of grace and nature, provided that by nature we understand that condition of ungodliness which is " natural " to us because we are born in it. It is important, however, to remember that this condition is not, in the last analysis, " natural " at all, but a melancholy accident; to be a " child of wrath " is an outrage upon nature as well as upon nature's God.

At all times men have been apt to set up artificial oppositions between grace and nature; and at all times others have tried to reduce real oppositions to unity. For instance, take the famous maxim: *facienti quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam.* To understand by this that grace is given automatically whenever any man in any circumstances of self-wrought depravity indulges a moment of remorse—

video meliora proboque—

or to suppose that grace is an epiphenomenon of human morality: such opinions cannot be called opinions about grace, for they simply deny one of the essential notions of grace, that it is a free gift. It may seem to follow from belief in the infinite mercy of God, who " will have all men to be saved," that grace must always and everywhere be available to men. In some sense, no doubt whatever this is true; the maxim just quoted is not to be altogether set aside. Any appearance of the idea of arbitrariness or caprice in an account of God's dealing with men is perfectly inadmissible. On the other hand it is equally improper to suppose these dealings mechanical. A university may escape human respect in the machinery of granting degrees;

but it cannot be in this sense that God is no respecter of persons. "Understand therefore that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land . . . for thy righteousness." It may have been through their own wrong-doing that the invited guests were excluded from the royal marriage-feast in the parable; it was certainly not for their good works, or for any motive discernible to man, that the substitutes were brought in. When we know the number and constitution of the elect people of God, we may expect to understand the terms of their charter; at present we are ignorant of both, and may fairly suppose the latter as inscrutable, for man on earth, as the former. Incidentally, it is as impossible for us to know the presence of, as it is to understand the reasons for, the gift of grace. We may conjecture, with a degree of probability amounting to moral certitude, that certain actions and certain lives are the fruits of grace; but they are human actions, human lives, and nothing but a special revelation will serve to indicate their eternal worth. In the Augustinian idiom, we are competent to evaluate the *officium*, but not to discern the *finis*.

There is thus an irreducible discontinuity between the operations of nature and grace. This is true not only in practice, but absolutely. Many philosophers and theologians have tried in various ways to establish the position that "nature calls for grace"; and, in the same attitude, have seen in the present condition of fallen man a proof that he must have been originally created in a state of innocence and grace, and then have sinned. It is true that the perfection of human nature, *la grandeur de l'homme*, is achieved only through the operation of grace; true that in the hypothetical state of pure nature the best aspirations of man would go unfulfilled, his moral failures lamentably outnumbering his victories. But this is the companion picture to that which science gives us of the physical world, where the unreleased energies of countless atoms, the infertile corruption of countless germs, give us no warrant for declaring that incomplete fulfilment establishes a valid claim to special assistance. Some achievement, indeed, there is:

> Strong thro' the turbulent profound
> Shoots xiphias to his aim—

achievement almost miraculous in all the circumstances, as the more philosophically minded scientists tirelessly remind us. So, in the moral world, there is the fact of grace,

wholly miraculous and unpredictable, affording man the possibility of glory. But a fact is not the same as a natural necessity. It may be doubted whether the constitution of the atom affords sufficient evidence to predict a sword-fish, and it is certain the constitution of man does not enable us to postulate the gift of grace. No more, despite Pascal's Baianist misunderstanding of the Augustinian doctrine, can we properly conclude, from an inspection of fallen man's estate, the fact of his former elevation. It is possible, indeed, to conjecture with great probability that a beneficent Creator would not have put man upon the earth, guiltless of sin, yet subject to all the inevitable temptations and difficulties of human life as we know them, without some special divine assistance; it is unlikely enough that we should suffer as we do if we were not involved in the effects of some racial catastrophe. So Aquinas held (*Contra Gentiles* IV. lii.); and Freud himself appears to suppose a kind of parricide Adam to account for the inhibitions universal among us. But it is of the essence of grace to be a free gift, whether to Adam or to us; a gift which is perfectly adapted to the conditions of human nature, but which does not belong to, and is not demanded by, those conditions.

NIGEL ABERCROMBIE.

Close of Cheltenham—II

FRANCIS CLOSE, the pupil of Charles Simeon, who became the early Victorian pope of Cheltenham, was a determined opponent of popery in all its forms. He was soon convinced that Tractarianism, if not the work of Roman Catholic agents secretly undermining the English Church, was but the first step in a path that led inevitably to Rome. Therefore he hated it and fought it. Once this conviction was firmly in the saddle upon him he felt that so righteous an end justified almost any means. He was willing to use practically any weapon that came to his hands. He fought Tractarianism, not only with sermons, pamphlets and platform speeches, but he brandished, and used, the powerful weapon of money. In 1842 he grew dissatisfied with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He detected Tractarianism in it.[1] In threatening to withdraw his

[1] *Cheltenham Journal*, November 14, 1842.

support he was, in effect, brandishing a yearly cheque for more than £300, representing the subscriptions of the whole of Cheltenham, which in practice he controlled. (The C.M.S. received about half of the £2,000 subscribed each year for Foreign Missions.) In politics the Reform Act of 1832 transferred power from the aristocracy to the moneyed middle classes. A similar transference was coming into effect in the Church in the first half of the nineteenth century. Power was passing from the aristocratic bishops and patrons into the hands of men like Close, who controlled a certain amount of the wealth and who therefore claimed a voice in affairs. The Church Missionary Society had been founded by Evangelicals in their zeal for taking the Gospel to the heathen. It was not intended to be a rival to the Propagation Society, but a complement. The S.P.G., according to its charter, worked amongst colonists, the C.M.S. was to go among the heathen.[1] Evangelicals supported both societies, but in practice their affections were held by their own society.[2] It needed only the discovery of Tractarianism in the S.P.G. to bring out the true position, and to make it obvious that the party system was at work in the Church. In 1847 the battle was extended to the National Society, which Close then discovered to be in the pockets of the Tractarians.[3] At once he ceased to support it financially. In 1853 he went a stage further. He was amongst the three hundred Evangelicals who walked out of the annual meeting of the National Society in London and in a nearby coffee-house formed their own rival "Church of England Education Society" to do precisely the same work.[4] Party tactics were in control. The Church was split into rival camps. In the support given by Close to the Government proposals for controlling schools—proposals objected to by the National Society—begins a new phase in which he begins to look to the secular powers for protection against Tractarianism. It was the budding of the Erastianism which flowered in the Ritual prosecutions of the sixties.[5]

Education was one of Close's chief concerns. In it he reposed his real trust. That was his practical, working creed, just as "The Bible and the Bible only" was the creed

[1] *C. J.*, November 4, 1839. [2] *C. J.*, October 24, 1842. [3] *C. J.*, August 9, 1847, also *Record*, July 15, 1847. [4] *C. J.*, November 18, 1854. [5] *C. J.*, October 23, 1848, and November 13, 1848.

he recited on the controversial platform. From the beginning of his incumbency he spent a great deal of energy in building schools. When he took up his work there was in Cheltenham a Sunday School, a Charity School, and an endowed Grammar School (these latter both decayed), and a recently formed National School. He set out to form a branch Sunday School, and in seeking for subscriptions he met with two brothers, Joseph (a member of the "Clapham sect") and William Wilson, the virtual founder-patrons of the Church Infant School system in London. They each gave £20 on the condition that the building be used during the week as an Infant School.[1] Close was doubtful, but was converted by the zeal of the brothers and by the books of Wilderspin, the high priest of the system. Wilderspin himself was brought down to start the school by running it for six weeks. After that, Infant and National Schools multiplied under Close. In 1841 he made a new venture, when with others he formed the Cheltenham Proprietary College (now known as Cheltenham College). It was based upon "the Christian religion, the Gospel of God, the religion of the Bible,"[2] but its aim was educational, not controversial. Close and his friends wished to provide for the education of their own sons.

Six years later he formed another educational institution. Its purpose was controversial, for those six years intervening had for Close been years of anti-popish fever. In 1846 the Government had established the pupil-teacher system in order to help to supply schools with trained teachers. Training colleges became much more important as the pecuniary advantages promised to those who passed through them shepherded future teachers within their gates. Evangelicals were dissatisfied with the National Society, and they were shocked at the "medieval ritual" adopted at the Society's Training College at Chelsea. Diocesan colleges offered no guarantee of sound doctrine, so they sought to establish a school for the elect at Cheltenham.[3] A society was formed in London, but Close made the cause his own even though the suggestion was not his. He travelled around speaking and preaching

[1] *C. J.*, December 10, 1849. [2] *C. J.*, August 2, 1841. [3] *Record*, July 15, 1847: "As the principles of St Mark's, Battersea and Whitelands are not approved of, it is proposed to create a college in Cheltenham where the true principles will be taught and Tractarianism in all forms excluded."

on behalf of the college, raising funds by his vivid denunciations of Tractarianism and by his pamphlets with their ever increasing variety of types and capitals to give due emphasis to the seriousness of the position. Even his very real enthusiasm for education did not escape the corroding acid of anti-popery.

The Training College scheme brought to a head a conflict that had begun to show itself earlier. The Church in the nineteenth century was beginning to organize its work on a diocesan basis. As the work churchmen set before themselves became less generally philanthropic and more specifically Church work, the Church unit of organization asserted itself. For building churches the "Gloucester and Bristol Diocesan Church Building Society" was founded in 1835; for providing Church education the Diocesan Education Society was formed in the following year.[1] The Evangelicals, however, had always organized their work in Societies. They had been but a minority of the Church, not in control of the official machine of the Church of England, and so they organized themselves independently of it in order to accomplish their ends. When in 1847, many years after most of their societies had been founded, they formed a society for supporting the Cheltenham Training College, they inevitably came into conflict, not only with the local diocesan scheme for a college at Bristol, but with schemes in other dioceses to which Close travelled in order to raise funds. The old Evangelical organization by societies came into collision with the new organization by dioceses. Close supported the diocesan scheme in that he sent his own subscription, but much of the money he raised for the Cheltenham College was really diverted from the Bristol College. He justified this by saying that the bishop had no monopoly in the initiation of good works within a diocese.[2]

Cheltenham felt the full force of the Evangelical method of working through societies. The faithful could, if they wished, attend each year nearly thirty annual meetings of societies connected with the Church. With Close the most popular of these were the Church Missionary Society and the Church Pastoral-Aid Society (though after 1851 this Society suffered in his estimation through its refusal to disregard the parochial organization of the Church of

[1] *C. J.*, May 28, 1849. [2] *Ibid.*

England.)[1] Various societies for converting the Irish and the Jews also collected large sums. These annual meetings, with their attendant sermons preached on behalf of the society in question, which were, in fact, merely ordinary sermons with their tails twisted so as to direct attention to the alms-dish, were the chief things done for Cheltenham society by the powers that ruled the parish church. Of religious organizations there were but two in the parish, the Auxiliary of the Church Missionary Society (which met monthly and for a while had a junior branch) and the Sacramental Lecture (rather in the nature of a Communicants' Guild), which met on the Friday night before Sacrament Sunday (the first Sunday in the month).

For the poor there was but one such effort made (as distinct from the admirably organized District Visiting Society), and that was only for men. After the Chartists paid a visit to the parish church on a Sunday morning in 1839, Close formed the "Church of England Working Men's Association," an institution similar to those which the Church was beginning to provide all over the country as a counter-attraction to the Mechanics' Institutes.[2] The class distinction implied in the name was soon abandoned, for the fare provided by the Association was too heavy for "working men," too heavy even for the tradesmen and clerks who were its real supporters from the early days. Most of the weekly lectures were theological, such as, "On the Nature of Miracles," and soon they became controversial. In spite of such desperate efforts at reform as Close's relaxation of his censorship of books for the library and the multiplication of the scientific lectures,[3] the institution died a lingering death.

Of the Chartists, Close had no understanding whatsoever. When, as was a general practice with them, they came in a body to Cheltenham parish church in order to advertise their cause, Close met them by a sermon in which he advised them to go home, count their blessings, and be quiet. He reminded them that many of those whom they envied as being rich men had started as poor men, and that nowhere else than in England was there such a ladder to wealth. This method of approach was common at the time and, in effect, relied upon the industrial revolution to cure

[1] *C. J.*, November 19, 1853.
[2] *C. J.* November 25, 1839.
[3] *C. J.*, December 16, 1844.

the diseases it brought to society. Close commended his view to the Chartists by saying: " What your wishes are I do not pretend to know or understand. I believe you do not understand them yourselves, except it be to bring down all that is above you and produce one common level. What folly is here!"[1] To him socialism was but atheism, and even teetotalism was suspect as being a movement of working men and socialists.[2] When George Jacob Holyoake, one of the salaried missionaries of Owen's Rational Religion, lectured in Cheltenham on May 24, 1842, he was manœuvred into making an open declaration of his atheism. A trial for blasphemy followed, but the circumstances both of the meeting and of the arrest were such as to cause a scandal which was heard in the House of Commons. Close's name was inevitably connected with the scandal, and though there is no evidence that he was responsible for sending the men who provoked Holyoake's outburst, it seems probable that he was implicated. Cheltenham " fanaticism " certainly gained a bad name through this affair, even though it was chiefly a political matter, a way of discrediting " socialism."[3]

Close was, however, critical of contemporary industrial organization. Companies and corporate bodies, he observed, were devoid of conscience. They oppressed the working class and did what individuals would scorn to have done acting from greediness of gain.[4] He tended, though, to see oppression only in forcing working men to work on Sundays, and as the affair only of companies. Society as a whole was exempt from criticism. He proclaimed himself a Conservative in politics. He did not deny the charge of preaching politics from the pulpit (Simeon had had to face a similar accusation), instead he met it by justifying it. " In my humble opinion the Bible is conservative, the Prayer Book conservative, the Liturgy conservative, the Church conservative, and it is impossible for a minister to open his mouth without being a conservative."[5]

For a year or so after the Chartists' visit to the parish church in 1839 he preached, at intervals of three or four months, sermons for the working classes. It was strong

[1] " Sermon to the Chartists," August 18, 1839, p. 20. [2] *C. J.*, December 27, 1841. [3] *C. J.*, June 6, 1842; July 25, 1842; August 15, 1842. [4] *C. J.*, March 3, 1845. [5] *C. J.*, January 25, 1841.

meat that he dispensed, arguing always from the Bible, which many of the Socialists no longer admitted as having any authority. To Close it was infallible, its meaning self-evident. If only the people could be taught to read the Bible, if only the Irish peasantry could be presented with Bibles, all would be well. They would be weaned from Owenism and popery.[1] There was no need, he affirmed against the Tractarians, of tradition to interpret the Bible.[2] Only when he was facing difficulties connected with education, a matter on which he felt strongly, did he admit that the Bible alone, without teaching and commentary, was insufficient. When Dissenters pleaded for the exclusion of the Catechism and all dogmatic teaching from schools, Close maintained that "the Bible in the hands of a Socinian or a Papist can be an instrument of evil."[3] In effect, therefore, he admitted that the Evangelical interpretation of the Bible was just as much a tradition as was the tradition to which the Tractarians openly appealed.

This was the dry orthodoxy of Cheltenham against which F. W. Robertson rebelled.[4] Catchwords rather than charity marked the true Christian. Close controlled and maintained this orthodoxy. He had a remarkable control over the town by reason of his popularity as a preacher and the support which the local newspapers gave him after his first few years. His career of church building—he built three churches and was interested in three other proprietary churches (even though an act of pious regard for Simeon caused him to denounce the principle of proprietary churches before he left the town)[5]—decreased his income by the fees he voluntarily resigned, but it secured his hold over the Cheltenham clergy. "I would have taken care long before this to have turned him out,"[6] he said of Sibthorp. He annoyed Bishop Monk intensely by speaking of the town clergy as "my clergy."[7] He was openly acknowledged as the Pope of Cheltenham. His picture was painted in words with great faithfulness—by Close himself. "I

---

[1] *E.g.*, *C. J.*, September 11, 1843: "We put this book into the hands of Romanists, and if they honestly do their duty in reading it to their neighbours we will abide by the result." [2] "The Written Tradition—the Only Divine Rule of Faith and Practice," Sermon preached November 5, 1842, etc. [3] *C. J.*, March 5, 1838. [4] Stopford Brooke, *Life and Letters of F. W. Robertson*, p. 78, Library Edition, 1872. [5] *C. J.*, November 7, 1854, and November 1, 1856. [6] *C. J.*, November 15, 1841. [7] F. Arnold, *Our Bishops and Deans* (1875), vol. ii., p. 304.

detest an ecclesiastical autocrat who sits down and determines that no book shall be read or system taught but what he chooses, constituting himself a puny standard of orthodoxy."[1] It was said that the temporal interests were not divorced from the Papacy of Cheltenham. The endowment of the parish was but £15 a year, yet his average annual income, derived almost entirely from pew rents, was about £1,200. In 1839 he was presented with £2,350 to pay for the handsome house he was building himself on the outskirts of the town, a mile or so from the church. He was criticized for choosing such a position, and the fact that he chose to build there is an interesting comment on the accusation that many Evangelical clergy, especially in industrial towns, lived either out of the parish or some distance from their people.

In 1855 Palmerston became Prime Minister for the first time. Shaftesbury was anxious as to the nature of his ecclesiastical appointments, for " Pam " was not conspicuous for an intelligent interest in Church matters.[2] He soon discovered that there was no cause for anxiety. Palmerston turned to him for advice in practically all ecclesiastical appointments and always took his advice. Shaftesbury became the bishop-maker. At first, not sure how long his reign would last, he appointed only definite Evangelicals. Later he saw fit to widen his choice to admit broad churchmen, and even one or two moderate high churchmen.[3] Tractarians alone were barred. In 1856 the first phase was still in progress and Close was an obvious man for Shaftesbury to choose. When he had laid the foundation-stone of the Cheltenham Training College a year or two before he had spoken very warmly of Close.[4] So in 1856 Close was appointed to the Deanery of Carlisle. The quarter of a century he spent in the border town was an anti-climax in his career. He is known always as Close of Cheltenham. His work in Carlisle was but a continuation of what he had been doing in Cheltenham. He built two churches, he raised funds for rebuilding the Infirmary. Controversial work went on as usual. Pamphlets and sermons against Tractarianism continued. He lectured at Exeter Hall on " Ritualism " (1867). His work was the same, and yet

[1] *C. J.*, February 17, 1857. [2] Hodder, *Life and Works of the Earl of Shaftesbury*, p. 507 (Popular Edition, 1892). [3] *Ibid.*, p. 609. [4] *C. J.*, April 25, 1849: " Your excellent pastor, marked as he is by zeal and energy in every good and pious cause."

there was a change in emphasis in that another interest was added. In Cheltenham he was transformed from a positive Evangelical churchman into a low church controversialist. In Carlisle he became a teetotal fanatic. It was, of course, a matter of emphasis. Teetotalism, like anti-popery, was something added to his original interests, yet these additions inevitably displaced something—and that something was his churchmanship together with the positive Evangelical insistence on the Atonement. In Carlisle he travelled even further from his Simeonite principles. Anti-popery had at least some theological basis; teetotalism had very little. When in the thirties it had been a militant crusade run by working men, Close would have nothing to do with the teetotal movement. He tried abstinence for a year, he found it conducive to morals, health and religion, but beyond that he would not go. Binding oneself by voluntary pledges was contrary to Gospel freedom, especially when one associated with men of all religious persuasions and none, anarchists and revolutionists among them.[1] By 1859, when he published *Why I have taken the Pledge* and *Teetotalism the Christian's Duty*, these arguments no longer had weight. The evil of drink had not become more obvious, but the teetotal movement had become more respectable. The early working men enthusiasts dropped out as the reverend gentlemen took their places on the platforms of an established movement.[2]

The real memorial to Close is not the marble tomb in Carlisle Cathedral, erected a year or two after his death in 1883. Nor is it the Dean Close School at Cheltenham, founded by the Western Circuit of the Clerical and Lay Association in memory of him. It is the Cheltenham Training College for Teachers which, whatever its present ecclesiastical position may be, is a monument to the controversial attitude of Victorian Evangelicals. Founded as a bulwark against popery in the vital matter of education, it is a symbol of a life so concerned with education yet warped through and through by hatred of "Tractarianism." Close could see no good whatever in the movement. "It is altogether wrong,"[3] he said. Instead of meeting its errors by emphasizing his own positive position, the Evangelical insistence on the dedicated life

[1] *C.J.*, December 27, 1841. [2] See J. L. and B. Hammond, *The Age of the Chartists*, p. 167. [3] *C. J.*, January 22, 1849.

of the individual, and the centrality of the Atonement, he replied with negations. "The Bible and the Bible only" war-cry was but a negative answer to the Tractarian appeal to the tradition of the Church, an answer all the more unsatisfactory because Close would not admit that he himself relied upon a tradition.

Close was not an original man. He was but the capable trumpeter of his party. The tragedy of his life is the tragedy of Victorian Evangelicalism in its failure to rise to its responsibilities when challenged, and so it becomes the tragedy of the Church of England, which now reaps the harvest in its divisions.

GEOFFREY BERWICK.

French Literature Now

THE French are pretty well agreed that their leading poets to-day are Paul Claudel and Paul Valéry. The first is a Roman Catholic. The second, to the extent that he admits holding metaphysical views at all, is a materialist. It does not follow that M. Claudel writes the better poetry.

M. Valéry served his literary apprenticeship with the Symbolists, who in breaking with the traditional rigidity of the French verse line declared themselves to be its emancipators. M. Claudel was introduced to his Muse by Rimbaud, a poet orthodox enough in prosody however daring in vocabulary and diction. Yet it is M. Valéry who scrupulously observes the hallowed rules of French metrical composition, and M. Claudel who has abandoned the alexandrine and achieved a prosodic revolution. Steeped in Scripture, M. Claudel has elected to make his unit of poetic expression the versicle of the Psalmist. This versicle he has sought to endow with the rhythm of breathing, and he would have it rise and fall with its intensity of feeling, vary with the force of its content, and pause at one time, surge forward at another, so that it should alternately surprise and soothe. The weakness of the innovation is that to write in versicles is deceptively easy. M. Valéry's control of his medium always seems perfect. His work has such finish and in each whole the parts are so fused that his placing of every word has been compared to a player's calculated moves of the chessmen. But it cannot be said that M. Claudel often attains to that

ultimate excellence in which both words and thought have the aptness of the inevitable. He writes (and I believe the sample is a fair one):

Et qu'il est beau, le fiancé, quand enfin, à ce tournant du Rhône,
Il apparaît, le premier parmi la troupe équestre de ses frères,
Lui entre tous les jeunes gens de son âge le plus grand et le plus beau, vêtu d'armes qui jettent l'éclair !
Ah ! qu'il la prenne déracinée et perdant l'âme entre ses bras
Comme une grande urne pleine d'un vin sans prix que l'on met debout sur la table d'un dieu, oscillant sur sa pointe aiguë.
Car à quoi sert d'être femme sinon pour être cueillie ?

Is this first-rate poetry ? I cannot think so. What M. Claudel seeks to do by saying " vêtu d'armes " and by applying the epithets " déracinée " and " cueillie " to one and the same woman does not justify the solecism which he perpetrates in the first place or the disharmonic imagery which he produces in the second. The simile of the " grande urne " is hardly a pleasant one to apply to a bride, and in being linked with the phallic metaphor, " oscillant sur sa pointe aiguë," it becomes repulsive. Furthermore, the theme of the passage as a whole is commonplace, and unquestionably could quite as well, if not better, have been said in regular verse.

M. Valéry has produced only one long poem—*La Jeune Parque*, published in 1917—and the number of his short pieces is by no means excessive. M. Claudel, on the contrary, has written copiously and has had the courage and the energy to undertake both the long imaginative poem and poetic drama. But whereas M. Valéry's consummate skill in the ode has led to his being found akin to Malherbe, M. Claudel's poetic dramas—*Tête d'or*, *L'Otage*, *L'Annonce faite à Marie*, *Partage de Midi*—have all the defects of ideological plays. The existence of too many scenes forbids any rise of dramatic tension, the language is often obscure, the plots remain clumsy and unimpressive. *Partage de Midi* ranks as his masterpiece. What is it about ? Mesa, an eastern prince, goes to Europe in quest of faith and the call to God. He returns without having found them. Ysé, a princess parted from her husband, becomes his mistress. Presently Mesa goes away on another journey. In his absence Ysé is unfaithful to him with Amalric. When Mesa returns once more, his pain on learning of her conduct is immeasurable. He is now fatally stricken. But as he lies dying he is at last invaded

by God. Ysé thereupon realizes that she has never really loved any one else. She refuses to preserve her life by staying with Amalric. She prefers to meet death with Mesa. It might be instructive to see how this plot has points of similarity with the plots of those medieval romances where love likewise obtains its fulfilment only in death. But if that digression must be reckoned impracticable, at least it is clear that *Partage de Midi* will be likely to leave the Christian consciousness, to which it is plainly addressed, feeling baffled and unmoved.

The fact is that M. Claudel's purely literary gifts do not appear equal to either his seriousness or his ambition. Moreover, like most prominent Roman Catholic writers in France during this century, he has stayed in bondage to the romanticism from which he constantly insists that he has broken loose. The touchstone here is Renan, whom he professes to condemn and despise. What made Renan not only tremendously popular but also a master at whose feet succeeding generations sat, is that his mind and style alike were pervaded by a vague religiosity having the seductive aroma of the infinite. So irresistible has been the specious charm which he was thus enabled to work, that Claudel, and also other Roman Catholic writers, such as Péguy,[1] Maritain, and Bernanos, are none the less his disciples for strenuously denying him. He has infected them every one; or, rather, they have all been predisposed to the second-rate emotionalism which he used to such strong effect. This, which was what he carried away from the Church, they have taken back to the Church; they defend the Church with the weapons Renan used against her. How thoroughly Claudel is in this sense a romantic is confirmed for us by his English preferences. He admires in particular, it seems, Blake, Keats, Tennyson, and Milton in that order; and we have warrant for suspecting that the Gustave Doré element is what stirs him in Milton and in Blake the apocalyptic strain. Claudel's religious faith, further, it would perhaps be unkind to call it sectarian, but it yet has about it some-

[1] Péguy, killed on the battlefield at the beginning of September, 1914, has exercised a growing posthumous influence in France. How his repetitive style marks time and how with a Catholicism which did not allow him to communicate he combines a perfervid nationalism, may well be seen in a volume of his writings which has just been brought out: *La France* (Gallimard).

thing too comfortable and assured. I am referring to a feature indicated by his recent passing remark that "Anglicanism is perishing like Antiochus, devoured by its own vermin."[1] This is a remark worthy of Dives who fared sumptuously every day.

I must not be thought, however, to wish to belittle Claudel. If Valéry is the more accomplished craftsman, and one who only embarks on what he can bring to port with full sail, one who never tries to express a notion that is not thoroughly within his compass and thoroughly digested, he is after all a minor poet. There is no connexion between the nature of a writer's convictions about the world and about life and either his power over words or his constructive abilities in narrative and drama. But the breadth and solidity of his convictions, the vigour and singleness of mind with which they are held—that of course does bear on the kind and scope of his literary undertakings. M. Claudel, who is now seventy-two, has not passed his life in the study. He is a distinguished diplomatist as well as a celebrated author. He has been his country's ambassador at Tokio and at Washington. Furthermore, he is exceptionally cultivated. Not only has he given much attention to the Bible and to some of the Fathers; he has also made a translation of the *Oresteia*, and is familiar with the Chinese drama, with Japanese poetry, and with Hindu art. M. Valéry, who is sixty-seven, has meditated on mathematics, on literary composition, and on such matters as the scientific side of Leonardo. But in comparison with M. Claudel's, his interests and experience have been narrow. His work, accordingly, does not demand of the reader any profound and comprehensive awareness of life. *La Jeune Parque*, in being his one long poem, is no doubt his most ambitious piece of writing. But it is the shorter *Cimetière marin* that has been judged his best, Like *Partage de Midi*, *Le Cimetière marin* has been called a masterpiece. Here are some verses from it:

> Et vous, grande âme, espérez-vous un songe
> Qui n'aura plus ces couleurs du mensonge
> Qu'aux yeux de chair l'onde et l'or font ici ?
> Chanterez-vous quand serez vaporeuse ?
> Allez ! tout fuit ! Ma présence est poreuse,
> La sainte impatience meurt aussi !

[1] Page 108 of book named *infra*.

Maigre immortalité noire et dorée,
Consolatrice affreusement laurée,
Qui de la mort fais un sein maternel,
Le beau mensonge et la pieuse ruse !
Qui ne connaît, et qui ne les refuse,
Ce crâne vide et ce rire éternel ?

Pères profonds, têtes inhabitées,
Qui sous le poids de tant de pelletées,
Êtes la terre et confondez nos pas,
Le vrai rongeur, le ver irréfutable
N'est point pour vous qui dormez sous la table,
Il vit de vie, il ne me quitte pas.

Amour, peut-être, ou de moi-même haine ?
Sa dent secrète est de moi si prochaine
Que tous les noms lui peuvent convenir !
Qu'importe ! Il voit, il veut, il songe, il touche,
Ma chair lui plaît, et jusque sur ma couche,
A ce vivant je vis d'appartenir.

How not be ravished by the perfect elegiac phrasing? But the power of a poem would indeed be weak were it no more than verbal. For that matter, its effect upon us cannot be restricted to what occurs in us as a result of the grace and sonority of its lines, nor even as a result of the associations which its several words and sentences conjure up before us. However beautiful in its elements, a poem has to be a whole, a whole composed of smaller wholes. The above passage is one such smaller whole, and when we consider what it does to us in being that whole we see that the appeal of a sentiment the inversion of Thomas Gray's is to something frail and confined to the superficial layers of our moods and consciousness. There lies the clue, I fancy, to the circumstance that although Valéry has published but a few poems, they are all except one of them short. It is inconceivable that Valéry should ever attempt a tragedy, for instance; he is evidently a stranger to the wide sympathies, the awareness of the interplay of good and evil, that would enable him to do so. He has never truly committed himself to life, and his Muse proves almost altogether literary.

Claudel has the wide sympathies and the awareness all right, and it may be on that very account that Claudel is the inferior artist. Both Claudel and Valéry are, in addition to being poets, prose writers of a stately and studied

elegance. Claudel, moreover, tackles in prose subjects at once abstruse and of special importance to those who, like him, would hold the Christian faith. In his most recent essay,[1] for example, he points out that if there is a domain of the Scriptures in which the sense must be taken literally —a domain consisting of the historical books, of the unambiguous revelation of everything necessary to our salvation and to the manner in which we should believe, and of the Scriptural moral precepts—there is also what he would call the confidential order of discourse, a figurative field composed of resemblances and analogies oriented more or less directly and organically towards the revealed and confirmed event. He then goes on to expound some of the resemblances and analogies, and displays in doing so a splendid verve and a searching power of analysis. But however challenging and stimulating this essay may seem to us, it is still true that Claudel is more easily readable than he is there when he is contributing to some Paris newspaper an article about, say, Geneva. The newspaper article, that is to say, arouses and retains (for the moment) a reader's interest with less effort of attention on that reader's part than he will need to bring to the essay. The fact is, of course, that the more lofty, recondite, and complex a prose writer's subject-matter, the more difficult it is for his literary skill to operate to the full, and that where literary art is at its best the content is often enough slight.

In this respect the productions of *Surréalisme* come to support the example of Valéry. *Surréalisme*, as a movement or school, is the one whole-hearted novelty that has been brought into French literature since the War of 1914-18. The school, at its inception, proclaimed that it had hit upon a new method of composition. Thanks to the indirect suggestion of psycho-analytic doctrine, the *Surréalistes* decided that the pen could and should be trained to write under the impulsion of the unconscious alone, and that what was thus written would draw its strangeness and truth from a semblance to dreams. There is no need to examine how far such a theory can be justified or how far the *Surréalistes* in particular have lived up to it. Literature is in no way an affair of schools. Like every other art or craft, it depends

[1] " Du Sens figuré de l'Ecriture," which serves as a preface to *Introduction au Livre de Ruth* by the late Abbé Tardif de Moidrey (Desclée, 30 fr.), itself an edifying and fascinating piece of exegesis by a priest who died in 1879 with his literary gifts virtually unappreciated.

exclusively on the personal talent of individuals. But among those who at one time or another have subscribed to the *Surréaliste* theory are one gifted poet and one remarkable writer of prose. Paul Éluard, the poet, writes thus in one of his happiest poems:

La hache la façon de tenir un verre brisé
La négation d'une fausse note les clous les fards
Le sens commun les algues les ravins l'éloge tout ou rien
La pourriture astrale et le reflet de son délire
La lune de rosée et beaucoup d'animaux gaillards
Dans cette ville disparue dans cette ville camarade
L'orage vagabond ses prunelles éclatées son feu virtuel
Le brassage des graines des germes et des cendres
Coin des Acacias masqué d'odeurs le sable fait la moue.

There is an absence of punctuation because punctuation is superfluous. M. Eluard may be credited with an ironic humour. But, also, by means of an incantatory recital and the associations of the discontinuous images which the recital should evoke, he is seeking in these lines to make his reader form an emotional impression—an impression at once vague and, as it were, magical. He sets about his task with a sure competence, and the cadence of the lines could not be more appropriate. Yet there can be no doubt that, however ingenious and musical the poem, its content is trivial, not to say illusory. The one excellent *Surréaliste* writer of prose is open to a reproach that seems different only because he uses a different medium.

I have omitted to mention that the *Surréalistes* have professed to ally themselves with the Communist International. As it happens, the prose writer in question, Louis Aragon, parted company with *Surréalisme* some years ago, but, theoretically speaking, there is no more thorough Communist. He edited the Communist evening paper in Paris, *Ce Soir*, till it was suppressed by the French Government at the end of last August after the French Communists had approved the Russo-German pact of non-aggression. His principal literary achievement has been two sections of a novel which he has intended shall have several more. The novel is, like the newspaper, propagandist in intent. By describing in it what he would have his readers accept as the conditions prevailing in bourgeois society, and combining with his description some sentimental love stories, he has wished to deliver a persuasive

apologetic of Communism. The two instalments published —*Les Cloches de Bâle* and *Les Beaux Quartiers*—are excellent reading. M. Aragon has studied Balzac to good purpose. And he writes well, though not narrative as well as he writes controversy. It was an early polemical pamphlet, *Traité du style*, that made his name. His would-be cynical presentment of the legend of the big bad capitalist and of the scheming French provincial politician has a savour all its own. And yet the novel, so far as it has gone, is not memorable. Aragon is too obvious a partisan, he has never felt deeply and comprehensively enough, to be able to construct a tale that we should be unable to forget.

My point up to now has been that when we turn to contemporary French literature we must not pick and choose our authors in the expectation that felicity of expression will necessarily be commensurate with importance of content. The French, if not more intelligent, are certainly more intellectual than ourselves. Every French writer is completely at home among theories and notions, and he cannot refrain from entering into discussion, so that at the very least he will enunciate a theory of his craft. Good writing, as in Valéry and Aragon, may be enjoyed for its own sake. But it repeatedly turns out, as in the case of Claudel, that where a writer has much to say his work has obvious literary shortcomings. But where there is a substantial content, a writer is likely to be worth reading for that alone, no matter if it means effort on our part. I should also suggest that it cannot be of any moment to us whether a Frenchman writes from the Christian standpoint or from some other, possibly less clear and definite. He may be provocative and exciting whatever his attitude. After all, the important thing is, not that an author should be a Christian, but that he should be read in a Christian spirit. Imaginative literature is neither of necessity nor even usually parabolic, and it is invariably devoid of all testifying value. A man may conceivably be inclined towards religion by reading a novel, but unless this is because that novel invests with a new significance what he already before reading it felt to be the facts of life, he will have been actuated by a delusion. For no novelist can observe life as it really is, since we do not know, any one of us, how life really is; a novelist can only describe life as he believes it to be.

It is with these considerations in mind that we can turn

with most advantage, I think, to the writings of three of the more prominent French novelists of recent years. They are members of no school, and indeed, as I have said, schools and influences do not matter. Each French writer, in fact each French literary work, asks to be read in isolation.

Unlike Aragon, André Malraux, the first of the three novelists, disdains the teaching of Balzac. He claims to derive from Dostoievsky, but actually Dostoievsky no less than Balzac understood the value of securing a reader's interest in his characters before trying to excite that reader's suspense at the course of the action. Malraux insists instead on plunging forthwith into the narrative, omitting all preparation of the reader. In his last novel, *L'Espoir*, he goes further. Its hero, so to speak, is the Spanish civil war. He sets out to convey the atmosphere that prevailed on the republican side. He was in Spain himself, but he relies on his imagination and on what he may have been told as much as, if not more than, on what he can have seen. He has not written a diary. His field is too wide to have been encompassed by any single personal experience. But he has entirely dispensed with plot. In this way *L'Espoir* stands forth as something new in fiction. Malraux once declared that in his opinion a diary may succeed better than a story in arousing the actual feel of life; and in *L'Espoir* evidently he has intended to produce the imaginative documentary equivalent of a diary.

But Malraux's essential theme is what makes him chiefly worthy of attention. His writing has no grace, and for one who would pass as a disciple of Dostoievsky he fails lamentably to make his psychology more than creakingly mechanical. These obstacles should not deter us from reading him in order to see what he has to contend about life. The leading characters of his novels he wishes typical of the individual man. The prevailing view is that we are all members one of another, and that the human individual exists only in the group. Malraux insists that the opposite must unquestionably be true. According to him, it is well that psychology should have superseded morality, for it is preferable to morality, since it is not ideals that are really important, but what is. He declares that a Chinese coolie who becomes class-conscious is thereby just beginning to live. The cause of the Spanish republicans was good because it quickened its supporters. He depicts his characters absorbed in eroticism and courting death. He

shows them rejecting the world and regarding both nature and their fellows as equally hostile. He makes them cling to life in the most humiliating and painful circumstances or meet death with a sense of overwhelming loss. It is all because he finds that we each live only once, that we each live alone, and that we each live really only in self-imagination. He has no faith in personal immortality, although he allows that some other kind of survival—whatever that can mean—may be possible. Hence he looks on a human life as unique and he holds that each has to make the most of his. But of course each life is, he recognizes, spent in an impenetrable solitude; and it is, according to him, thanks to that very solitude that each of us tastes life. In consciousness the human individual is aware of but two things—his sensation and his dream, and of the two the dream is the more important, the sensations serving only to nourish it, but the dream itself being both the experiencing of life and the assurance of selfhood.

The second novelist is Georges Bernanos, who, as I have already noted in passing, is a Roman Catholic. His first novel, *Sous le Soleil de Satan*, which he wrote at the age of thirty-seven, at once gave him a name, but his later *Journal d'un Curé de campagne* is looked upon as the finest thing he has done. It is not a great novel. Not only is he addicted to a certain magniloquence, but also he has other defects which are, however, difficult to define briefly. We may get an inkling of their nature from the second of two remarkably vigorous polemical books, *La Grande Peur des Bien-pensants* and *Les Grands Cimetières sous la lune*, which he has written in addition to his six novels. In *Les Grands Cimetières* he wars, possibly with justification, on those Roman Catholics in France—and they are the more numerous—who side with the political Right. At the same time he can see no good in the liberal Christian Democrats. He calls himself anti-Jewish. He imagines that there was a time in Europe when the vocation of arms ranked as the most honourable after that of the priesthood. He has fancied that France might be ensnared into fighting a war for the sake of the franc, as if a currency had ever benefited by a war. In short, for all the boisterous vigour with which they are expressed, his opinions are somewhat extravagant. But in *Journal d'un Curé de campagne* he nevertheless indicates with impressive acuity the pervading influence of religion in people's lives. The world he describes there might be

one in which faith was impossible and religion unjustifiable. There is poverty, intrigue, hate, doubt, apostasy, cunning, simplicity and death itself. And yet he is able to convey that the supernatural is active amid all this, and in the face of life precisely as the scoffers and the indifferent allege it to be, faith is felt triumphant.

Thirdly and lastly, I come to L. F. Céline. He is the author of two hauntingly original novels, *Voyage au bout de la nuit* and *Mort à crédit*. They are written in a slang frequently obscene, a transposition of the everyday language of the inhabitant of the more populous Paris suburbs. The use of such a vocabulary and syntax contributes largely to establishing for a reader who finds them intelligible —and of course Frenchmen who would not normally think of expressing themselves in these terms understand them very well—an unreal world, a world of fantasy and horror, through which the chief character of each novel moves and in which he meets distorted figures and adventures. We all know that life is often horrible and can appear aimless except as an inexorable advance towards death. Most people in comfortable circumstances or with too much work to do thrust the consciousness of that aspect of life far back in their minds. Céline seeks to make his reader bring the consciousness back to the surface for the sake of being given a new literary sensation. He describes living as if it were a nightmare, pierced now and then by sentimentality, and even by sentiment, but nevertheless a nightmare fascinating and repulsive at one and the same time. He does this from the standpoint that only a narrow and sordid egotism truly pays. The most valuable feature of his experiment is, I feel, that the same nightmare treatment of life would be immensely more effective in a work of fiction that appealed in its readers to an opposite, and wider and loftier, interpretation of how we live and have our being.

Montgomery Belgion.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. M. A. C. Warren is the Vicar of Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge.

The Rev. William Paton, D.D., is Secretary of the International Missionary Council.

Dr Nigel Abercrombie is Professor of Modern Languages at the University College of the South-West, Exeter.

The Rev. Geoffrey Berwick is the Rector of Milton, Cambs. The first instalment of his article appeared in our September number.

Mr Belgion lived in France for many years, and he is acquainted with a number of the leading writers as well as with their work. From 1932 till the beginning of this year he contributed a series of " French Chronicles " to *The Criterion*, and reviewed a variety of French books in *The Times Literary Supplement* from 1934 till this summer.

" A Visit to Germany " is contributed by a theological student who visited that country during the summer.

Miss Deanesly, the author of *A History of the Medieval Church*, is now a lecturer at Bedford College, London.

The Rev. G. Stuart Watts is the editor of the (Australian) *Church Standard*.

NOTES

A VISIT TO GERMANY

(*Communicated*)

This account can claim none of the " synoptic " character of a survey; its only background is a stay of two months, lived mostly among church-people and theological students, and for the first part obscured by the mists of an unknown language. The part of the country visited is exceptional, in that a certain intellectual independence still derives from the university, and the Confessional and German Christian members of the Church are still working together in a considerable degree of quietness.

Church services were for the most part quite free of interference—there was one reminiscence of the departing congregation being scrutinized by uniformed men—and congregations seemed about the same as the average in this country. With one exception politics were not mentioned in sermons. At Frankfort the situation was far more difficult, with more interference and supervision from the authorities. All organizations among the young people such as the Student Christian Movement have been forbidden; but local groups are permitted to work in

direct connexion with a church and under its pastor, which is in some ways a gain. Activities are limited to singing in almshouses and hospitals at the week-end, and small Bible study groups; and occasionally a larger party will go together for a week-end in the country. I was present on one such occasion. About fifty men and women, mostly university people, but with some others from the town, and a number of members of the teaching staff, and several pastors from various places, met in a small village, where preparations had been made by the pastor. The first afternoon was taken up with a paper, and discussion of it, on the apocalyptic passage of Dan. vii and Rev. xiii; the interpretation given was that this is a time of the Antichrist (there have been before times of the Antichrist, and may be again, but for us this is the time); therefore it was to be anticipated that the attack on the Church, evident already in Germany, will be intensified, and will spread throughout the world, and succeed; and that the mission of the Church was to be faithful to its essential task of proclaiming the Gospel. We had the evening meal in the homes of farmers in the village. Afterwards a play was performed by the students in the church, watched by as many of the villagers as could be accommodated —a very simple and impressive play on the Parable of the Great Supper. At the morning service the church was crammed to the extent of its three galleries. After lunch there was singing, followed by a paper on the religious situation among young people in England, and a report on the state of the Church struggle in Germany. This kind of co-operation between young people and the country parishes is one of the good things that the difficulties of the Church have forced upon it in Germany.

I was assured that the chief danger of the Church at the present was that the members were not sufficiently alert to the dangers that faced them, and were liable to be surprised by inroads on their liberty, and to have no heart to resist. For the moment the situation is comparatively quiet. But the pressure is kept up in unobtrusive ways. It has already been reported in this country that in the Rhineland some ninety pastors have been deprived of their stipends; their congregations have still to pay the same amount to the officials, and are forbidden to raise double money—though the pastors are still being supported. Two monasteries in Austria have also been robbed of their lands. The young are steadily alienated from the Church—a comic song about Adam was even thought fit for exhibition to a party of foreigners visiting a Hitler Jugend camp under official auspices. The songs learnt by the troops are steadily declining in quality, and some of them are deliberate parodies of the creeds and of hymns. The pay of pastors becomes even smaller and more uncertain, and parents are unwilling to recommend their sons to enter the ministry. At Marburg, for

instance, the number of theological students has declined from about 400 to 93. The most recent move has stirred considerable feeling. All the students without specific excuses were ordered to volunteer for service in the harvest; but the theological students were not permitted to do so. There was a strong tendency to let the matter go, but some took the lead in demanding an explanation or a reversal of the order; at Bonn some eighty Catholic students were imprisoned following a protest meeting; professors spoke in their lectures of the rejection by their own people of those whose duty it was to serve their people by the preaching of the Gospel; officers among the students wrote to their superiors asking them to protest against the insult to the army. Finally the authorities gave way; theological students were permitted to serve, on condition that they did not speak of religion to other people working or to their hosts, or make any formal contact with the Church in the places where they were sent. The actual closing of the theological faculties does not seem to be immediately anticipated; it is said that the authorities regard private seminars, an increase in the number of which might follow such a step, with more concern.

It happened that the present writer met among Confessional students almost exclusively the view, claiming to be Lutheran, that a Christian should take no part in politics, and should in matters where the Government normally has control—for instance, when the Government orders a man to take part in war—obey without question any order of the Government of the day, however evil the Government might be. But it was reported that this view was by no means universal. It was also stressed that the function of the Government was to provide a stable social order in which the Church could carry out its duty of proclaiming the Gospel. The view of many people in this country, that in various ways it was a Christian duty to defend democracy, was summarily dealt with; the position was regarded as on all fours with the view of the German Christian party, who regard the present regime as the embodiment of " positive Christianity "; it was therefore the duty of the true Church in England to combat this view, as the Confessional Church was bound to oppose its counterpart in Germany. Only round condemnation was met with of the pronouncements of Barth on the duty of defending democracy. The only German Christian preacher I heard took as his text John ii, 11, " This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee "; he proceeded to argue that the age of miracles was not past, and in tones of religious awe unparalleled in the rest of his sermon, spoke of the coming of Adolf Hitler and the transformation of the country under his régime; the remainder of the sermon was mostly occupied with personal religion and the miracles that

were to be observed in individual lives, though the presence of the great miracle among the German people was never far from the speaker's mind. There seemed nothing material to distinguish the line of thought from much that, *mutatis mutandis*, is frequently to be heard in this country.

The feeling of detached observation experienced in this last service was the one exception to the strongest and most abiding impression of the visit—the practical assurance that here was a part of the one Church in whose worship the stranger from England was as much at home as the German congregation; that, in the words of Pastor Niemöller's last Whit Monday sermon: " *We* do not make the unity of the Church: that is in the *one* Lord; and so far as the faith and the recognition of this one Lord grows and is rooted in us, so far grows and is rooted among us the one Church as the Body of Christ, and so far does the division which tears us apart from one another disappear."

WHY DID THE FRIARS FAIL?

The question was propounded to the writer on behalf of some one practically interested in the foundation of a community of the Franciscan type today, who, meditating on the new venture, was anxious to avoid, if possible, mistakes that might have led to the " failure " of the friars earlier. The question invites rejoinder from all interested in Church history and might be answered *ex corde*, without any special learning or diving into the records of the mendicant orders, somewhat as follows. It might be contended:

First, that the friars did not fail, absolutely: they shared the fate of other religious orders at the various Dissolutions in the sixteenth century; but some continental houses maintained themselves, and there was a renascence of friars (particularly French ones) in the nineteenth century. The Roman Church makes much use of them today for foreign missions, as well as at home; and in any case many of the multitudinous Roman orders, especially missionary orders, are founded on the model and experience of the earlier friars. We may demur to the expression " the friars failed," absolutely.

But secondly, why was there a certain reaction against the friars in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, still ages of faith and fervour? Why had the friars (possibly) less influence for good in 1500 than they had in 1300? (You find, for instance, the Brothers of the Common Life deliberately rejecting mendicancy and protesting against it.)

Here it is important to recognize that, while the absolute value of the ideal of poverty remained the same, the use of mendicancy, as a means of maintaining the daily life of the friars, was more

suited to the first generation of friars, living a small, casual life in Italy, than it was to later generations who had to educate great numbers of young friars, possibly in a university, and maintain friaries to do it. They not only educated young friars, they taught secular clerks in theology schools. This meant raising a lot of money, being anxious to obtain legacies, etc., all of which appeared to the layman, on the face of it, troublesome to himself and inconsistent with the emphatic profession of poverty. It is not fair to blame the friars; the first generation, like St Francis himself, contained many men who had had the best secular inspiration and education obtainable at the time, before they became friars; if they preached, they converted not merely because they were holy, but because they were interesting. But young uneducated novices: if masses of these were to become good preachers, they had to be taught. The Church, at the end of the twelfth century, in council after council, had cried out for better educated clergy, and the friars eventually supplied the need. It was quite miraculous that they did it. But the machine they created to do it could only be maintained by methods in apparent conflict with their ideal. The man in the street got tired of being begged from. Probably a frankly held, landed endowment, formed of gradually accumulated legacies, seemed to him less troublesome.

Thirdly, there is the obvious fact to be considered that the Church's need changes from generation to generation. A religious body created to meet a specific religious need will not, in any case, attract the same number of devout spirits in later generations; they will try to grapple with a later need. If a community's organization appears able to serve its own century, that seems to be abundantly sufficient to aim at. The first friars succeeded (apart from the grace of God) because they put the old monastic ideal of complete detachment from self before the masses for the first time; they affected the masses much more than the monks were doing. They popularized the old religious ideal. Now this could only be done *once for the first time*. They were more democratic in personnel than the monks had been, and *this was new*. They offered a religious aspirant of equal devotion, but only mediocre ability or talents, or social class, much more outlet than the monasteries did, and *this for the first time*.

Finally, the very success of the friars led to the starting of " active communities " after the Reformation, more or less on their lines; and this drew away aspirants from the friars.

If there is any moral to be drawn from mistakes of the pre-Reformation friars, perhaps it is that it was the spirit of poverty, detachment, which was important; and that the outward manifestation of it by the forms under which their income was acquired, or the veils under which their endowment was held,

were not of first-rate importance, or necessarily to be copied in another century. The French Dominicans originally held all their endowment through the Dominican nunnery of Prouille: their land nominally belonged to the nuns. The English Franciscans lived in houses generally owned by the town council: a possibility in a catholic age, hardly a possibility now. But it was not, ultimately, the *way* in which the friars acquired or managed their income that gave them their influence; it was the completeness of their detachment.

As to whether there was inner failure among the friars before the Reformation, that would be very hard to say. It is harder to keep alight a fire of devotion in an age moving away from an old ideal than in one when the flame is newly lit. The writer certainly would not like to say that God considered the friars of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries as having " failed."

M. Deanesly.

COMMENT ON THEOLOGICAL PERIODICALS

A Cambridge professor once described a recent volume of Gifford Lectures as " an attempt to write round theology." One cannot help feeling, as one reads the recent issues of journals which profess to make it their business to deal with religion in general and the Christian religion in particular, that the majority of them have fallen into the same error. If it be true that many of the Puritans of past days were so filled with the vision of a City of God that they cared little to make this world a reflection of it, it is equally true that the Humanism of the present age has so infected the minds of many Christians that it has bred in them a morbid preoccupation with the affairs of earth. The Puritans fixed their minds on an imaginary heaven of the future and forgot the claims of earth. We are in danger of trying to create a heaven and earth of our own devising, and of forgetting that it is by faith in the unseen power and presence of God that we shall be enabled to prepare the kingdoms of this world to become the Kingdom of our Lord. In short, the business of the Church is to proclaim the Gospel, to teach men about God, not to concern itself with the mere improvement of social amenities or the relations which exist between states.

Yet, even before the present crisis, the subject of international politics played a prominent part in articles appearing in the various theological journals this summer. Some of these have considered definite political reasons for world tension; others have asked what Christianity can do to relieve the strain. The *Hibbert Journal*[1] for July has three articles dealing with the question from the political point of view. Professor Olof Kim-

[1] Allen and Unwin, London. 10s. per annum.

berg of Stockholm, in "Mental Disease as a Present Factor in the Causation of War," thinks that those countries which have a definite war-mindedness are suffering from a mental disease imposed upon the masses by their leaders, the symptoms of which are brutality, intolerance, belief in the religious character of their principles, and a total misconception of values. If allowed to run its course he considers this disease will destroy civilization. In the same journal Dr David Thompson, discussing "New Currents in Political Thought," is more optimistic and thinks there are indications of a creative period in politics. Lastly, in the same number of this journal, Mr Chaning Pearce, a schoolmaster, sees the direct road to political recovery in education. He advocates that teachers should realize the necessity of developing individual opinion and a sense of responsibility to the community in the individual adolescent. The June number of *Christendom*[1] has two articles on this subject: "The Tragedy of Spain," by Nicolas Berdyaev, and "The Church and Civilization," by Jacques Maritain. Both these articles show the sincerity with which the writers urge the co-operation of Christians to stop war and to oppose totalitarian atheism, but their ideas are somewhat vague and have little constructive value. Diocesan magazines are also influenced by the international situation. *The Liverpool Diocesan Magazine*[2] (May), for example, has a well-reasoned article by Professor Norman Sykes, showing the difficulties of applying the principles of universal Christian Brotherhood to international relations.

We would agree with Professor Sykes that "the best service Christians can render to foreign affairs is to demonstrate that unity among themselves." But it does not follow that that unity can best be achieved by a superficial reunion of the existing Churches. Apart from the June number of *Reunion*,[3] which devotes itself entirely to the question of the Reunion of the Churches, this perennial dispute is dealt with in *East and West Review*[4] (July) by the Archdeacon of Gibraltar, who considers that the diocese of Gibraltar, extending as it does both east and west, should make the possible reunion of the Churches a definite ambition. On the other hand, the Spring Number of *Pax*[5] contains an article by Dom Bede Griffiths which, while welcoming some points in Dr Goudge's *Church of England and Reunion*, quarrels with the latter's statement that authority is always of a spiritual nature, and holds that reunion can only take place when the Church of England recognizes the authority of Rome.

It is refreshing to find that the majority of journals, in spite

---

[1] Basil Blackwell. 2s. [2] Liverpool Diocesan Publishing Co., Ltd. 3d. [3] Baxter's Press, Oxford. 6d. [4] S.P.C.K. 1s. [5] Catholic Records Press. 1s.

of their preoccupation with power politics in State and Church, devote some space to the subject of Religious Education. Here the Church has a definite vocation. *The Modern Churchman*[1] (July) pleads for a body of clergy who are completely trained teachers of religion, and secondly for laymen, equally well trained, to teach Religious Knowledge in universities and schools. *The Clergy Review*[2] (July) urges the same policy, with additional emphasis on the need for a wider reading of the Scriptures by the laity, in an article by Mgr Barton entitled " Consolatio Scripturarum."

Articles which may be of help to clergy and students can be briefly noted, as follows: " The Nature of our Knowledge of God," by Professor John Line; " The Righteousness of God," by Principal Lofthouse; and " St Paul's Conception of Christ," by Rev. G. J. Inglis; all in *The Expository Times*[3] for July. The August number of the same journal contains an excellent article on " The Eisodus and the Exodus," by Professor Rowley, and much information about the theology of the New Testament under the title " The Real Unity of the New Testament," by Canon Mozley. " The Separation of Christianity from Judaism," by Professor Floyd V. Filson, in the *Anglican Theological Review*[4], merits careful attention. Among more critical studies may be mentioned " The Ancient Book and the Ending of St Mark," by C. H. Roberts, and Dr Telfer's continuation of his study of the " Didache and the Apostolic Synod of Antioch," which appear in the July number of *The Journal of Theological Studies*.[5]

But these are articles for the specialist and student. If the Church is to proclaim the Gospel, to teach men about God, it is of little use to write round theology for the layman. The need for Religious Education—among adults no less than among children—is everywhere being admitted. What is wanted now is literature on the Bible, the Church, and the Sacraments which the intelligent layman can read. Surely, there is scope here for some of our less technical journals to proclaim the Gospel anew?

CLIFFORD W. DUGMORE.

---

[1] Basil Blackwell. 1s. [2] Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 2s.
[3] T. and T. Clark. 10d. [4] Evanston, Illinois. 1$ quarterly.
[5] Oxford University Press. 5s. quarterly.

SURVEYS

(A) RECENT MISSIONARY LITERATURE

Dr Kraemer, in his impressive contribution to the preparation for the Madras Conference, *The Christian Message for the Non-Christian World*, summarizes the present situation as follows:

> "All the evidence . . . drives irresistibly to the conclusion that the Christian Church is not at the end of its missionary enterprise in the non-Christian world, but just at the beginning. The independence and the autonomy of the daughter Churches in the non-Christian world does not mean a gradual withdrawal of the activities of the parent Churches. On the contrary, the fact that the Christian Church actually has become a world-community, the responsibility this involves and the solidarity in faith and love and hope in which the older and younger Churches have been thereby bound together, point to the obligation of renewed missionary consecration and activity."

This individual verdict is endorsed by the common judgment of the world-wide Christian Community as represented at Madras and most forcefully expressed in the report of that Conference, *The World Mission of the Church—Tambaram*, 1938 (International Missionary Council, 1s. 6d.). The student of world affairs and of the Christian impact upon them will make a serious error of judgment if he lightly dismisses this report. Here, speaking clearly for the first time, is the voice of that younger Christendom, that rebirth of Christianity, which is the real hope of the world and may yet prove to be the dynamic to revitalize the older and tired Christendom of the West.

The delegates from seventy nations who met at Madras during Christmas-tide of 1938 were conscious that their meeting at such a moment in world-history was not only profoundly significant but was itself a miracle of the grace of God. The fact that German and Englishman, Chinese and Japanese, and a host of others, could see beyond their acute national differences the oneness of their spiritual heritage and the essential unity of their religious experience enabled this Conference to make a positive declaration of Faith in God over against the confusion of the world; and, what is more important still, an uncompromising assertion that it is only in Jesus Christ that God is revealed as all-sufficient for the needs of mankind. It was just because "Madras" found this theological unity to be a reality that it was able to give a new impetus to the movement for Christian re-union.

But hardly less important was the evidence that Madras brought of the vigour of the indigenous Christian Churches in

Asia and Africa. No longer will it be possible for the Christendom of the West to consider itself *in loco parentis*. God has brought a new thing to pass, and in more ways than one the Churches of the Orient and Africa are, out of their liberality, contributing to us. That is the inescapable conviction that rises as we read the pages of this report.

The unhappy fact, however, is true that the thinking of the Church in this country, whether represented by the leaders or by the rank and file, has not yet even begun to be adjusted to the realities of the world-wide Church. The lamentable lack of proportion in our Church budgets, the parochialism reflected in our Church controversies, our insularity, and not a little of our defeatism, are all to be traced to a general ignorance that God is doing a new thing in the world. Sheer ignorance lies at the bottom of our failure in adjustment. That is why *The Missionary Church*, by Prebendary W. W. Cash (Highway Press, 7s. 6d.), is a book of such real importance. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who, as is well known, very rarely contributes a foreword to any book, says in the preface: "I have been so closely associated with Prebendary Cash in dealing with both the administration and the problems of Christian Missions overseas, and I am so strongly convinced that what he has written demands and deserves the attention of all Christian people, that I must make an exception to my usual rule. This is a book which ought to enlarge the mind, quicken the imagination, and stir the spirit of all who read it. . . ."

Dr Cash traces the history of modern missions with a sure hand. There can be few who know that history with anything like his comprehensive grasp. But there may well be some who will be surprised and perhaps disconcerted by the emphasis which he gives to the significance of the Moravian Church and the Evangelical Revival in the expansion of the Christian Church into a world-wide community. Both of these made an impact far wider than did the Anglican Communion. Such surprise will in part be due to the widespread ignorance of the fact that in the missionary work of non-Roman Christendom the Anglican Church plays only a comparatively small part in relation to the whole. Imposing preparations for Lambeth, 1940, should not make us lose our sense of proportion. Indeed, it might be suggested that a real sense of proportion would result in the decision that Lambeth, 1950, should be held in Burma or Sumatra, Korea, Singapore, or Ceylon. That, at least, is the pressure of the logic of Madras, of all the missionary activity of to-day, and, be it added, of the latest unified Statement of the Missionary Council of the Church Assembly.

But Dr Cash's book is not only a shrewd interpretation of the history that *has been* written. It is also a careful analysis of the history that *is being* written at the moment. He is dealing with

the immediate situation, and he is looking forward to the day after tomorrow. In this book, as in much contemporary missionary literature, there is enforced again and again the fact that the younger Churches overseas are facing today problems of a social and economic character which in a very real degree condition their approach to re-union as surely as do their theological preconceptions. Members of a richly endowed Church like ours may very easily make a serious mistake if they underestimate the fact that behind the eagerness of the younger Churches for re-union there is, side by side with deep spiritual conviction, a pressure of economic realities that will not be gainsaid. Dr Cash brings this out very clearly in his chapter on the self-supporting Church.

The whole subject of the indigenous Church and its self-support receives further most careful and detailed treatment in *The Economic and Social Environment of the Younger Churches*, by J. Merle Davis (Edinburgh House Press, 2s. 6d.). This book should be read as a companion to Dr Cash's prophetic commentary on the Missionary Church. Dr Davis's book is in effect the report of the Department of Social and Economic Research in preparation for the Madras Conference. A justification, if one is needed, for this really valuable survey cannot be better expressed than in the following words of Dr Davis himself:

> " Evangelism, education, and medical work are the three dimensions in which the missionary movement was conceived. The economic and social environment of the Church forms a fourth dimension whose importance has only slowly been recognized. Now when the structure has reached a considerable height, it is found to be insecure because of the neglect of the fourth dimension, which to a large extent has been taken for granted by the Western Church, and has been considered as an incidental rather than as a determinative factor in the progress of the Church. The Church, in many parts of Asia, is perilously near a position of stalemate because it has ignored, underestimated, and not understood this factor. Christian strategy demands that the Church should deal with the fourth dimension as seriously and with as much energy as it deals with the other three."

Dr Davis's book not only deals fully with such problems as land tenancy, indebtedness, marriage customs, caste, and unemployment in their bearings on the capacity of the indigenous Churches to be self-supporting, but he also gives illustrations of how these problems are being solved. This is a challenging and valuable book.

The three books reviewed above represent the outstanding contributions of the past year to the understanding of the Church as a world-wide community at this critical moment in world-

history. But this is not to disparage a very great deal of most valuable illustrative material which has also appeared. Pride of place in regard to such illustrative matter must be given to *Partners—the Unified Statement* (price 1s.), obtainable from the Church House, Westminster. This is a more than usually coherent document, and on that account more useful than in some past years. But chapters x and xi should be read first, and then re-read, and then underlined. When that discipline has been undertaken, and only then, can the rest of this most fascinating report of Anglican missionary enterprise be *safely* enjoyed.

As an illustration of the social environment of the younger Churches, especial note should be made of *Heritage and Beauty*, by Daniel Johnson Fleming (Friendship Press, New York, $1.50), which though published several years ago is not yet as well known in this country as it should be. The book consists for the most part of beautiful pictorial studies of modern Christian architecture in Asia and Africa, which illustrate the influence of indigenous cultures. Although Dr Fleming has not exhausted the material available (such beautiful examples as the Chapel at Peradeniya, the Churches at Yezd and Shiraz, and St Bartholomew's, Zaria, and many others have been omitted), his book serves to show how really the Church of Christ is beginning to speak to the soul of other races in their own vernacular.

Any book by C. F. Andrews must always be welcome. In *The True India* (George Allen and Unwin, 3s. 6d.) he continues his lifelong rôle of mediator between India and England. At a moment when the political development of India has reached a new and critical point of development it is of the first importance that judgments on the Indian situation should be formed under the guidance of men like C. F. Andrews, and not under that of such irresponsible journalism as produced *Mother India*. *The True India* contains one serious gap in its failure to say anything about the fearful problem of debt which is such a conditioning factor in the economic and social life of India. Mr Andrews covers so many aspects of the Indian scene that one may be forgiven for regretting that nothing has been said in his book about this question of such first-rate importance to the understanding and helping of India.

The Church of the T'ang Dynasty, by John Foster (S.P.C.K., 4s.), originated in a desire to present Chinese students with a knowledge of the early history of Christianity in China. It will have value for Western readers as putting within their grasp much new knowledge of the eastward expansion of Christianity in the first nine centuries. No satisfactory answer, however, is given to the pertinent question: "Why did the Nestorian Church leave no trace but a stone monument?" The possible answer to this urgent query is to be found in Dr Cash's book, and hints are also found in Dr Merle Davis's study of the social and

economic background of the younger Churches. But Mr Foster's book is an essential prerequisite as a work of history.

Christianity in Action (Longmans, 2s. 6d.) is a vivid record of Christian work in war-time China produced by seven missionaries. This is a real tonic and inspiration. It contains, moreover, a challenge relevant to ourselves. Air raids are not so inconceivable a concomitant to our worship in this country but that the Chinese Church may set us a valuable example in the art of " keeping our heads."

John Steward's Memories, edited by M. R. Newbolt (Phillipson and Golder, Ltd., Chester, 5s. 6d. net; post free, 5s. 6d.). With the exception of a brief and helpful introductory memoir, this book is a personal record by the late Bishop of Melanesia of his own impressions written as he journeyed about that ocean diocese both before and after his consecration as Bishop. Interpretations of missionary history and studies of missionary strategy are quite vital to the life and work of the Church. No less vital is the outpouring of personal devotion without which there will be nothing to interpret or to study. These *Memories* provide this essential touch.

The Church of India is passing through a critical interim period. The Indian Church Bill has given the Indian Church her ecclesiastical independence. But the Church of India is not yet Indian in her control. The transition to that stage will depend very largely upon the kind of Englishmen who are its Bishops in the meantime. In *Alex Wood, Bishop of Nagpur* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), Bishop Chatterton has given a most interesting study of a Bishop by nature so thoroughly English who yet so whole-heartedly set himself to serve the Church of India. In the natural course of development there cannot be many more Bishops in India such as Alex Wood. But the Church of India in the days to come will owe much to the fact that men like him have been her leaders.

" Many have written regarding the rising tide of modernism in Moslem lands. This volume deals with the under-tow." In these words of introduction the author, Dr S. M. Zwemer, defines the scope of his scholarly study of reactionary Islam, *Studies in Popular Islam* (Sheldon Press, 7s. 6d.). The development of religion has never been an orderly process of evolution. Dr Zwemer's book gives an insight into that obscure world from which at any moment there may come an outpouring of fanaticism that may influence the course of history. Ibn Saud, the Wahabi king of Central Arabia, and the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem come from a background which may yet prove as important for history as the Angora of Ataturk or the Cairo of Farouk. This background Dr Zwemer interprets from his unrivalled knowledge.

M. A. C. Warren.

(B) THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT IN AUSTRALIA

The calm of the Australian religious world, unfortunately, is rarely disturbed by the strong breezes of creative theological thought. By the departure of Dr P. A. Micklem for England the Anglican Church lost one of its very few front-rank theologians, though men of undoubted theological ability are not lacking, and there are eminent authorities in allied spheres of research. Few of the clergy continue serious theological study after ordination, since most of them serve in far-flung, understaffed parishes which make the maximum demand on time and energy. As a result, instances of arrested development are by no means rare. Many who value the Tractarian tradition are content to think with Gore, and regard with mild disapproval the attempt to approach the mysteries of faith from a fresh angle. On the other hand, the tradition of the " inerrant, infallible Book " is tenaciously held in conservative Evangelical circles, reproducing in many minds the worst of Tennessee Fundamentalism. Between these two groups there is an increasing number of Liberals—Central Churchmen (reflecting the Maurician outlook), Liberal Evangelicals, and Liberal Catholics (the latter owing much to Tyrrell and von Hügel and, among living writers, to Karl Adam and Wilfred Knox). There are few avowed Modernists in Australian Anglicanism, and most of these are Anglo-Catholics. Barthianism has found little favour in the Church; its influence is far more apparent in the Free Churches. The " Papalist " or " Catholic Reunionist " position claims a small number of adherents, though the Church in Australia, as a whole, is strongly anti-papal in the sense that it decisively rejects the papal claim to infallibility and universal sovereignty over the Church. In passing, it may be mentioned that talents which in happier circumstances might be applied to pure theological research, have to be devoted to the defence of Anglican and Orthodox Catholicity against the attacks of Roman Catholic controversialists. *The Church Standard*, the only weekly newspaper for the Church in the Commonwealth and in New Zealand, maintains a strong Liberal Catholic policy and wages unceasing warfare against obscurantism and sectionalism. The *Australian Church Quarterly*, edited by the Rev. Farnham E. Maynard, of Melbourne, a periodical of enlightened Catholic thought, publishes from time to time articles of considerable theological merit which help to guide the thought of the clergy and laity along profitable lines.

The strength of the party spirit in certain areas of Australian Anglicanism amazes and distresses the visitor, who sometimes fails to realize that it is one of the least desirable elements in the Old World's legacy to the New, seen in all its unpleasantness in a small, isolated community. Many Australian churchmen

find it extremely difficult to consider theories on their own merits apart from the persons who profess them; though in this we are perhaps little different from our brethren in other lands. As a first step towards combating this unfortunate party spirit, a more adequate system of theological training will have to be devised. The Roman Catholics, wise, as usual, in their generation, have one central ecclesiastical college for the supply of " secular clergy " throughout Australia. In glaring contrast, the Anglican Church has a multiplicity of theological colleges, diocesan and provincial. Some of these institutions have a definite party foundation, whilst others have become associated with a particular type of churchmanship, and are consequently avoided by those who wish to be " good party men " (*horribile dictu*, the phrase is not infrequently heard in certain quarters) of another colour. A broad-based, non-partisan theological college for the whole of the Commonwealth is urgently needed and, we are sure, would be welcomed by the able teachers in the various colleges who are doing their best with the present inadequate system. If located in Sydney, such an institution, we may hope, would co-operate with the Joint Theological Faculty within Sydney University, established by the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches some twenty years ago—a Faculty justly described by its first Professor of Hebrew, the late Dr Andrew Harper, as " the finest theological faculty in Australia." In any case, Church life and the prospects of reunion will be vastly improved when young Australian ordinands learn to think fearlessly and honestly, without reference to party or denominational presuppositions, and to discern the shining of the Logos-light in systems of thought and modes of worship different from their own.

Mention must be made at this point of a teacher whose influence towards this end is simply incalculable—the Rev. Dr S. Angus, Professor of the New Testament in St Andrew's Presbyterian College and the Joint Theological Faculty, within Sydney University, author of *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*, *The Religious Quests of the Græco-Roman World*, *The Environment of Early Christianity*, and other works. A vigorous and independent thinker, he has taught hundreds of students—and, by means of the written word and public lectures, thousands of others—to dispense with the crutches of authoritarianism and stand erect as God's freemen in the world. Successive attempts in his own Church to convict him of heresy have failed, and this lovable scholar is now able to give his undivided attention to a work whose importance for the future of Australian religious life and thought it would be difficult to exaggerate. He has been accorded special mention here because his influence transcends all denominational barriers, and his teachings, with their strongly marked ethical approach to theological questions, are

welcomed or rejected—according to the point of view—with a quite remarkable degree of intensity. In the opinion of very many, in all the Churches, the professor is worthy of inclusion with Tyrrell in von Hügel's company of " self-spending children of the dawn and of Christ's ampler day."

Until recently, Australian university education was completely secular: no university possessed a theological faculty, nor were any specifically theological subjects taught in Arts faculties. That defect has now been remedied, so far as Sydney is concerned, by the institution of a theological faculty after years of patient endeavour on the part of a small band of scholars, among whom the Warden of St Paul's College, Canon Garnsey, has an honoured place. In Brisbane, largely as the result of Archbishop Wand's influence, theological subjects are now included in the Arts curriculum—an example which may soon be followed by other institutions of higher learning.

Australian religious life is seriously weakened by the gulf which yawns between the study and the pew with regard to the scientific investigation of the Bible and of Christian origins. The laity, as a whole, are lamentably ignorant of both the methods and the fruits of modern biblical criticism and, consequently, fall easy prey to the hordes of " cranks " and fanatics who wander about, seeking whom they may devour. The pulpit must mediate between the study and the pew in this matter, for a surprisingly large number of people never read anything of a worthwhile character; hence in most cases the useful " popular " apologetic literature, now so easily accessible, falls wide of its mark. In a disquietingly large number of instances, the pulpit itself is of no use—in some cases it is even a definite hindrance—in this task; for the preacher is either hopelessly out of touch with modern thought or violently opposed to it, or both. Some alert bishops have established diocesan lending libraries which help to keep the clergy out of the intellectual backwater into which a multiplicity of practical duties so easily thrusts one. But the tragic fact remains that, to the average Australian, the Bible is a sealed book: and the consequent loss to the national character is incalculable.

In recent years, in both the Anglican and the Free Churches, under the influence of the Oxford Movement, there has been a marked emphasis on the Incarnation and its " extension " in the Church and the Sacraments, issuing in more reverent and ornate church buildings and services, on the one hand, and social reform crusades on the other. Some Anglicans have given a magnificent lead in the application of the Gospel to social conditions by pioneering slum clearance and child welfare schemes; whilst bishops and other leaders of thought perform a valuable service to the Church by endeavouring, at clergy and

student conferences, to make clear the basic theological principles of Christian social action.

The present grave crisis in international affairs is driving many people in this land to a reconsideration of the Christian message, for the bankruptcy of non-theistic humanism and the diabolical character of totalitarian paganism are manifest to everyone who thinks. Theology is presented with a glorious opportunity to demonstrate the rationality and sufficiency of the Christian *Weltanschauung*, and there are encouraging signs that the thinkers of the Church are alive to the situation, and are preparing to deal with it in the spirit of the leaders of theological thought in other times of crisis, though in " forms and fashions " very different from theirs.

G. Stuart Watts.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE RELIGIOUS PROSPECT. By V. A. Demant. Frederick Muller. 7s. 6d.

Fr Demant's volume is one of the most significant contributions to an understanding of the present religious situation that has appeared in recent years. It is an attempt by an unusually acute and powerful mind to find a clue to the central meaning of the struggles of our time.

The author begins by looking at the historical scene and asking what is happening there. The most fundamental thing in contemporary life is the revolt against liberalism. The basal assumptions of a whole epoch have been called in question. How does it come about that ideas which for so long held undisputed sway are now passionately repudiated? The answer is that the relentless logic of history has forced into the open the inner contradiction of liberalism. It has made clear that the professed doctrines of liberalism were at bottom incompatible with its assumptions about the nature of reality.

To see what this really means, we must understand the profound difference between doctrines, which are consciously held intellectual opinions, and what Fr Demant calls dogma. By dogma he means a fundamental and habitual attitude to life, a basal assumption about the nature of reality, which is the real, though often unconscious, determinant of men's actions.

The essential doctrines of liberalism were belief in an objective truth and objective goodness, in a natural law anterior and superior to the positive law of any particular state and in a universal human element in man that does not come out of, but is brought to, his social relationships. What is implied in these beliefs, however, is the conviction that man has a link with a reality transcending his temporal existence. They do, in fact, derive historically from the Christian revelation and tradition by which not only the intellectual outlook but the emotional attitudes of Western culture have been largely formed. But it is precisely this fundamental dogma about the true nature of man, from which the doctrines of liberalism drew their sustenance, that liberalism not only ignored but denied. It substituted for it the contrary dogma that there is no other dimension than the temporal and that reality is the flux of becoming. The present revolt against liberalism, while it vehemently repudiates its doctrines, is in essential agreement with its dogma. The totalitarian philosophies are philosophies of becoming, and as an element in the flux of history the individual has less claim to status than the state or the community. When man is deprived of his super-temporal being the only refuge that is left to him is mass solidarity.

No bare summary can convey the impressiveness and force with which the argument is presented. The conclusion is that it is on the plane of dogma, as an ultimate conviction about the nature of man and the universe, and not on that of moral exhortation and advice, to which the Churches are so prone, that Christian faith has to meet the struggles of our time. The religious outlook which will survive the present crisis is one which has the power to interpret its true meaning, and so enable men to surmount it.

It is Fr Demant's firm grasp and incisive handling of this central issue that makes his book notable. There is no space to discuss the many specific questions which arise in the development of the main theme, such as his contention that it is Catholic thought, in contrast with religious liberalism and continental theological Protestantism, that can provide the insights which are capable of interpreting, and so of directing, history; his illuminating exposition of the inevitable and violent clash between the rationalist and vitalist interpretations of existence, when the attempt is made to understand the life of man in terms of the world process alone; and his insistence on the deep split in the Christian mind—which, as he recognizes, cuts across ecclesiastical divisions and is found within the same religious communion—between " cosmic interpretations which bring God within the world process and purely redemptive theologies which take man as religious out of it, leaving his actual existence at the mercy of its floods."

These and other related questions which Fr Demant poses—for the scope of the book does not permit a full discussion of them—call for the most vigorous theological thinking of which the Church to-day is capable. It is the great merit of this volume that it vitalizes theology by demonstrating its intimate connexion with the most pressing problems of actual life. But if we accept Fr Demant's definition of dogma, it is evident that intellectual effort alone will not suffice. What is needed is the recovery on a large scale in actual experience of the conviction that man has his real being in his relation to God, as a living faith which determines men's attitude to the problems both of their personal lives and of society.

J. H. Oldham.

Church and State. By Karl Barth. S.C.M. 2s. 6d.

On September 19 of last year Karl Barth wrote a letter to a Professor in Prague, a letter on which Reinhold Niebuhr, in *Radical Religion* (Winter, 1938), commented:

> " Barth, the exponent of dialectical theology, has proved himself to be not sufficiently dialectical. In all the years before this crisis his ' no ' to the problem of culture and

civilization was too unreserved, and in the hour of crisis his 'yes' is too unreserved." (Quoted in THEOLOGY, March, 1939.)

The background to Barth's letter to the Professor in Prague is to be found in the booklet translated under the title *Church and State*. The booklet consists simply of a paper—a very long paper—read at a gathering in the town of Brugg of Reformed clergy of Canton Argau on June 20, 1938. The date is important in view of the subsequent discussion of what is called Barth's new position, and it is unfortunate that in this translation the date of the original paper is not given.

The circumstances, too, are interesting. Barth was the Vicar of Safenwil in the Canton of Argau when he wrote his *Römerbrief*. Thus Barth gave this paper to his own people, presided over by one who had known Barth while he was still a young minister.

Further, Brugg is half-way between Basle, the university of Barth's influence, and Zürich, the university of Brunner's. Barth and Brunner had previously met in a village in Canton Argau to see if they could agree on the question of their attitude to Natural Theology, but neither had been able to yield a point. Amongst those who heard this paper and who took part in the subsequent discussion there were disciples and collaborators of Brunner. All these factors warn us against supposing that Barth has really given away his central position, however much in this paper he may appear to have done so.

Barth's concern in this paper was to expound the teaching of the New Testament concerning the true nature of the state. The true state is the heavenly Jerusalem, and of this state the Christians are already citizens. They are therefore strangers in any earthly state. Yet the earthly state derives its dignity from the heavenly Jerusalem. "The state, as such, belongs originally and ultimately to Jesus Christ" (p. 29). Its task on earth is to administer justice. So long as the earthly state gives freedom to the Church to proclaim the Gospel—God's justification of man through Christ—that state may be described in a derivative sense as a just state. This freedom the democratic states do accord to the Church. But the state may become, and in this sinful world does become, the "demonic" state. The "demonic" state no longer does justice, no longer gives freedom to the Church. Then the state is false to its true nature. "In this encounter of Pilate and Jesus the 'demonic' state does not assert itself too much, but too little; it is a state which at the decisive moment fails to be true to itself" (p. 21). Only the Church can recall the state to its true nature. Thus to recall the state is the primary duty of the Church to the state. This duty is fulfilled first by prayer for the state

and for those who exercise authority. But the Christian's duty cannot stop with prayer: it must pass on to action, to political action, even to revolutionary political action: " We may have to ' overthrow with God ' those rulers who do not follow the lines laid down by Christ " (p. 80)—even to defensive military action against the unjust state—" we are right in seeking to defend our frontiers " (p. 76).

But, though Barth speaks of a just state, and reminds the Christian of his duty to that, and every other kind of state, Barth never forgets that earth is not heaven, not even a miniature heaven.

Barth is always a preacher, conscious not only of his responsibility to the Word of God, but also of his obligation to utter that Word in the concrete human situation. The *Römerbrief* was uttered to the world of liberalism, a profound warning against a too facile equation of Christian and political action. Its consequence was that the Christian found himself impotent to do anything because all action is sinful. To this man Barth has now spoken of the duty of action, yes, of political action. But he has not forgotten that that political action will still be sinful action. He has simply stressed the duty to act.

J. O. Cobham and Ernst L. H. Gordon.

God of the Living or Human Destiny. By R. H. L. Slater. (The International Library of Christian Knowledge.) Nicholson and Watson. 8s. 6d.

The task of a reviewer is made more difficult when the object of his review is itself in the nature of a review. Mr Slater's book can be most aptly described as a review of a number of important religious and philosophical problems in a style which, for the type of matter dealt with, is remarkably clear and attractive.

In his first chapter the author states emphatically: " But if my work has any value at all, it lies largely in the attempt to relate these conclusions to a definite basis of first principles "; and in the course of the book he shows not only how the dogmas of Christianity are relevant to the problems of to-day but also that this relevance is derived from the universality of Christian dogma over and above any particular expression of it in philosophical terms. As the author rightly asserts on p. 263, " An orthodox belief is often confused with a traditional belief. There is ground and need for distinction." And he is able to illustrate this point in the discussion of divine immutability. The reader must be warned not to assume that he has grasped Mr Slater's meaning until he has finished the chapter dealing with this question. Not until then will he be in a position to appreciate

the balance of the argument. This is a difficulty which will be encountered in varying degree throughout the book; and the reader must resist the temptation to jump here and there, and must resolve to settle down to steady reading from start to finish.

The author is perhaps least happy in his treatment of the problem of time and eternity, and at his best in the consideration of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. It is a pity that he does not take more seriously his own judgment (on p. 76) that it would " be better to discard the terms time and eternity altogether and restrict ourselves to the terms *temporal* and *eternal*." The isolation of the " time-dimension " in an already abstract " space-time " concept produces insurmountable difficulties for the solution of the time-eternity problem. Mr Slater cannot be accused of ignoring this fact, but he fails to " cut his losses " until the last few pages of the chapter. It is not easy to avoid the fact that human awareness of eternity comes from the conviction that experience in this world requires for its adequate interpretation a view which sees this world as a real but partial phase or section of the complete reality which is eternal; and the author would have been justified in devoting to the development of this theme some of the space which he uses in a rather inconclusive discussion of related ideas. It would be unfair to insist that in some cases the arrangement of the argument does not help the reader to grasp the author's real point, without admitting that this defect is a result of his desire to be impartial in presenting ideas alternative to his own. At most, our criticism is that the variety of material placed before the reader may cause him mental indigestion. There is certainly nothing dull in this book. The author's first-hand knowledge of Eastern thought and religion enables him to illustrate his ideas very widely, and he has succeeded in handling some very difficult subjects with clarity and with a relative absence of jargon.

This is not a book for the armchair. But it is the right sort of book for an intelligent person interested in and attracted by the Christian religion and a little worried by what he may imagine orthodoxy to be.

C. D. WADDAMS.

BISHOP SEATON OF WAKEFIELD. Addresses and a Memoir by the Bishop of Burnley, with a Foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury. S.P.C.K. 5s.

" All men are dear to God because they are men." . . . " There is only one way by which we win people: it is by really caring for them and respecting them." And again, " Ordination does not mean a restriction, but an enlargement of our humanity." These extracts, taken from a sermon published in this book, on " The Broad Humanity of Christ," reveal the

mind of the man who taught them; James Seaton lived them out in life and ministry.

This book is not in strict sense a biography, mainly because, as the Bishop of Burnley says in his preface, " Seaton's contribution in all his different spheres of work was not that of great achievements conceived and carried through, . . . it was always and everywhere the same—namely, himself and his personality." In the thirty pages which constitute the memoir, we are enabled to follow James Seaton through his work in the Yorkshire parish, in the theological college (especially at Cuddesdon), in South Africa (at Johannesburg), and in the Wakefield diocese, winning the affection of those with whom he was brought into touch, by his belief in their goodness, his unfailing humour, and an imperturbable optimism, which was the fruit of his own deep personal religion. Bishop Neville Talbot, who served as his curate at Armley, tells how a woman in the parish cheered him on his way to a difficult meeting with the words, " Nay, t'little vicar has all his buttons on !" an apt saying which might receive many applications.

The Provost of Wakefield adds a short chapter on Dr Seaton's principalship of Cuddesdon. " It was," he writes, " his freedom from any kind of clericalism, with his good humour and common sense, which won the confidence of new arrivals. . . . He was well content that the college should neither accept nor turn out men of one type." As he himself said in a sermon at a Cuddesdon Festival, " This College does not stand for a flat and undifferentiated catholicism "; indeed, that would not be possible under such a Principal.

The selected sermons occupy some hundred pages. It is a pity, perhaps, that the selection was not made from those addressed to a more diverse type of congregation, but we should be sorry to miss the five addresses given in Lent to the Cuddesdon men on the various points of penitence. Many of us, who are yet in the nursery school of prayer, find the more formal books on ascetic theology to be wearisome reading, but here, in these sermons, is a good man speaking to us in simple, direct language, out of the depths of his own spiritual experience. It is not that he ignores the more classical works; Fr Baker's *Divine Wisdom* is quoted more than once, so also is Dr Chandler's *Ara Coeli*; but he meets us more than halfway. " All technical words in spiritual writings," he tells us, " need life breathed into them," and that is just what Jimmy Seaton does; and again, he comforts us by saying, " I do think that one of the first things we all need to learn is to sit rather freely to the forms of prayer and the methods of spiritual training which are suggested by our devotional manuals. We must not get it on our conscience that we have to use all we find there, but only what really helps us to walk with God, and to discard what does not."

The criticism might be made that the sermons occupy a place out of proportion to the memoir; in these, however, Dr Seaton speaks to us in his own person, and the layman will appreciate them no less than the younger clergy and the ordination candidate.

We are grateful to those who have given us this book; and we put it down with thankfulness to God for a type of saint-hood which is so distinctively of England, and of the Anglican Church.

B. K. CUNNINGHAM.

THOMAS AQUINAS. Selected Writings, edited by M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. (Everyman Library. Dent. 2s.)

The Everyman list of theological and philosophical books is not large, and it is a sign of the times that St Thomas should appear in it, especially as the present volume cannot owe its publication to its utility as an academic textbook, as do, perhaps, the Descartes, Spinoza, and Berkeley, since for such a purpose it is too curious and too fragmentary in its selections.

The Master of Campion Hall and his collaborators deserve the highest praise for the lucidity and correctness of the translation, which it is a pleasure to read. It is no small merit to present a version of a scholastic writer which one can be sure of understanding without reference to the original. The printer has unluckily inverted one or two phrases.

From the great wealth which St Thomas's works contain, no selection of a short 300 pages can please every man, and we shall all regret that this or that is omitted. It has been the purpose of the editor to show St Thomas as a theologian rather than a philosopher, but with particular stress on his rational theology. The *pièce de resistance* is the section of the *Contra Gentiles* which defines the Divine Nature (I, 14-34). There is evident a discrimination against the doctrine of God as efficient cause, which involves the neglect not only of the causal proofs of God but also of the articles defining God's causality and creativity. The proofs one can well dispense with, but the absence of the more constructive discussions of the same theme gives a balance to the Rational Theology, which St Thomas would perhaps have found surprising.

The other materials chosen are miscellaneous, and illustrate with great ingenuity and pleasing variety the scope of St Thomas's work. As an anthology to delight the reader who already knows the obvious things, nothing could be better. Here we have some short sermons, the Corpus Christi office with its hymns, specimens of the philosophical commentaries which so few of us have ever looked at, and several of the most beautiful and interesting theological articuli. When we have tried it on a newcomer to St Thomas we shall be better able to judge whether it suits

him equally well or whether longer and more systematic extracts from fewer writings would have proved more informative.

There is room for twenty anthologies of St Thomas, but there will hardly be a better than this is, on its own principles of selection; and if it sends readers to the full text for further enlightenment, that is the best possible result. St Thomas exercises over his disciples a binding spell; once an introduction has been effected he can be trusted to look after himself. As a first instrument of fascination this anthology is perfect: the beautiful clarity, the serene and devout reasonableness, the direct vision of realities could not be more happily illustrated.

AUSTIN FARRER.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: T. H. Hughes, *The Psychology of Preaching and Pastoral Work* (8s. 6d.); W. M. Urban, *Language and Reality* (21s.).

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: Father James, *Christian Philosophy* (6s.); Cardinal Merry del Val, *Memories of Pope Pius X* (3s. 6d.)—personal impressions of Pius X by the Cardinal who was his Secretary of State.

CAPE: J. Middleton Murry, *The Defence of Democracy* (10s. 6d.).

C.L.A.: J. V. L. Casserley, *The Church and the Rural Community* (1s.).

COLDWELL: F. Jürgensmeier, *The Mystical Body of Christ* (12s.).

HARMONY PRESS: L. Greening, *I Have a Message* (1s.).

HEINEMANN: P. F. Drucker, *The End of Economic Man* (8s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: A. C. Bouquet, *A Lectionary of Christian Prose* (10s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: O. Piper, *God in History* (9s.).

MOWBRAYS: W. H. Elliott, *Ten O'Clock Talks* (2s. 6d.); J. M. Swift, *The Parish Magazine* (1s.); Bede Frost, *You : Your Nature, Your State, Your Need* (3s. 6d.); A Member of C.S.M.V., *God Persists* (1s.).

THOMAS MURBY: U. Wells, *Daniel, A Modern Prophet* (1s.); T. J. Wood, *Who was Jesus?* (6d.); St John G. Ervine, *Our Heritage* (6d.).

JOHN MURRAY: Sir Campbell Rhodes, *Visions of Youth* (2s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: J. Baillie, *Our Knowledge of God* (8s. 6d.).

RELIGIOUS BOOK CLUB: J. W. Brady, *England Before and After Wesley* (2s. 6d.).

J. B. SHEARS: L. Gillet, *Judaism and Christianity* (3s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: E. Barker and R. Preston, *Christians in Society* (5s.); F. A. Cockin, *The Holy Spirit and the Church* (2s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: A. H. Rees, *The Doctrine of Justification in the Anglican Reformers* (1s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher